

HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES.

WEDNESDAY, May 1, 1918.

The House met at 12 o'clock noon.

The Chaplain, Rev. Henry N. Couden, D. D., offered the following prayer:

Father in Heaven, whose blessings are new every morning and fresh every evening, canst Thou look down from Thy throne of grace upon this sin-stricken world and be still? Judge Thou, we pray Thee, between the enemies of free men who have precipitated a world-wide war on the lovers of peace and compel them to fight for peace. Encourage us by the words of Holy Writ: The race is not to the swift nor the battle to the strong. "A thousand times the vanquished, right, hath risen glorified" because of Thy strong right arm, because of Thy love of right. Be with us, we beseech Thee, with the power of Thy might and make us valiant in this hour of peril and give to us the victory for an everlasting peace, and pæans of praise we will ever give to Thee, for Thine is the kingdom and the power and the glory forever. Amen.

The Journal of the proceedings of yesterday was read and approved.

MINERALS AND METALS FOR WAR PURPOSES.

Mr. FOSTER. Mr. Speaker, in eliminating a section of the bill H. R. 11259, it throws out of joint the reference to sections, and I ask unanimous consent that the enrolling clerk be empowered to change the numbers to conform with the facts.

The SPEAKER. The gentleman from Illinois asks unanimous consent that the enrolling clerk be empowered to arrange the reference to sections in the bill H. R. 11259 to conform to the facts. Is there objection?

There was no objection.

MESSAGE FROM THE SENATE.

A message from the Senate, by Mr. Waldorf, its enrolling clerk, announced that the Senate had passed bill of the following title, in which the concurrence of the House of Representatives was requested:

S. 4410. An act to amend an act entitled "An act to provide, in the interest of public health, comfort, morals, and safety, for the discontinuance of the use as dwellings of buildings situated in the alleys of the District of Columbia," approved September 25, 1914.

The message also announced that the Senate had passed without amendment the bill (H. R. 10613) to provide for the collection and disposal of garbage and miscellaneous refuse of the District of Columbia.

APPROPRIATION FOR EXPENSES, HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES.

Mr. SHERLEY. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent for the present consideration of the House joint resolution which I send to the desk, and I ask unanimous consent that it be considered in the House as in Committee of the Whole.

The SPEAKER. The gentleman from Kentucky asks unanimous consent for the present consideration of a House joint resolution, which the Clerk will report, and he asks unanimous consent to consider it in the House as in Committee of the Whole.

The Clerk read as follows:

House joint resolution (H. J. Res. 284) making an appropriation for contingent expenses of the House of Representatives.

Resolved, etc., That the following sum is appropriated out of any money in the Treasury not otherwise appropriated:

HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES.

For miscellaneous items and expenses of special and select committees, exclusive of salaries and labor, unless specifically ordered by the House of Representatives, fiscal year 1918, \$40,000.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Kentucky?

There was no objection.

The House joint resolution was ordered to be engrossed and read a third time, was read the third time, and passed.

REGISTRATION FOR MILITARY SERVICE.

Mr. DENT. Mr. Speaker, I call up Senate joint resolution 124 and move that the House further insist on its amendments and agree to the conference asked for by the Senate. That is the 21-year-old bill.

The SPEAKER. The Clerk will report the title.

The Clerk read as follows:

Joint resolution (S. J. Res. 124) providing for the registration for military service of all male persons citizens of the United States or residing in the United States who have, since the 5th day of June, 1917, and on or before the day set for the registration by proclamation by the President, attained the age of 21 years, in accordance with such rules and regulations as the President may prescribe under the terms

of the act approved May 18, 1917, entitled "An act to authorize the President to increase temporarily the Military Establishment of the United States."

The SPEAKER. The gentleman from Alabama asks unanimous consent to take the Senate joint resolution 124 from the Speaker's table, insist on the House amendments, and agree to the conference asked for by the Senate.

Mr. CANNON. Mr. Speaker, I would like to ask the gentleman from Alabama if the gentleman does not want any further consideration of the bill.

Mr. DENT. That is all—that the House insists on its amendment.

Mr. CANNON. In the opinion of the gentleman no other motion is desirable at this time to be considered by the House.

Mr. DENT. I do not think so.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Alabama?

There was no objection.

The SPEAKER appointed as conferees on the part of the House Mr. DENT, Mr. FIELDS, and Mr. KAHN.

AUTHORITY TO PRESIDENT TO SELL WAR SUPPLIES—CONFERENCE REPORT.

Mr. DENT. Mr. Speaker, I ask to call up the bill S. 3803, authorizing the President to sell war supplies, and move the adoption of the conference report.

The SPEAKER. The Clerk will report the title.

The Clerk read as follows:

An act (S. 3803) authorizing the President during the existing emergency to sell supplies, materials, equipment, or other property, heretofore or hereafter purchased, acquired, or manufactured by the United States, in connection with, or incidental to, the prosecution of the war.

The SPEAKER. The Clerk will read the report.

The Clerk read the conference report, as follows:

The committee of conference on the disagreeing votes of the two Houses on the amendments of the House to the bill (S. 3803) authorizing the President during the existing emergency to sell supplies, materials, equipment, or other property, heretofore or hereafter purchased, acquired, or manufactured by the United States, in connection with, or incidental to, the prosecution of the war, having met, after full and free conference, have agreed to recommend and do recommend to their respective Houses as follows:

That the Senate recede from its disagreement to the amendment of the House, and agree to the same.

S. H. DENT, JR.,

W. J. FIELDS,

JULIUS KAHN,

Managers on the part of the House.

GEO. E. CHAMBERLAIN,

G. M. HITCHCOCK,

F. E. WARREN,

Managers on the part of the Senate.

STATEMENT OF THE MANAGERS ON THE PART OF THE HOUSE.

The managers on the part of the House at the conference on the disagreeing votes of the two Houses on the amendment of the House to the bill S. 3803, authorizing the President during the existing emergency to sell supplies, materials, equipment, or other property, heretofore or hereafter purchased, acquired, or manufactured by the United States, in connection with, or incidental to, the prosecution of the war, submit the following written statement explaining the effect of the action agreed on:

The difference between the two Houses consists in the fact that the Senate bill provided that the proceeds of the sale authorized in the bill should be used by each department or bureau whose products were sold, whereas the House insisted that the proceeds should be covered into the Treasury. The Senate accepted the House amendment.

S. H. DENT, JR.,

W. F. FIELDS,

JULIUS KAHN,

Managers on the part of the House.

The conference report was agreed to.

DISTRICT OF COLUMBIA APPROPRIATION BILL.

Mr. Sisson. Mr. Speaker, I move that the House resolve itself into Committee of the Whole House on the state of the Union for the further consideration of the bill H. R. 11692, the District of Columbia appropriation bill.

The motion was agreed to.

Accordingly the House resolved itself into Committee of the Whole House on the state of the Union, with Mr. GARNER in the chair.

The CHAIRMAN. The Clerk will report the bill by title. The Clerk read the title of the bill.

Mr. Sisson. Mr. Chairman, I will ask the gentleman from Minnesota to use some of his time now.

Mr. DAVIS. Mr. Chairman, I yield 30 minutes to the gentleman from Illinois [Mr. Mason].

Mr. MASON. Mr. Chairman, the beginning of my controversy with the gentleman from Alabama [Mr. HEFLIN] was occasioned by his speech in my absence in Chicago, while I was addressing patriotic meetings, supporting the administration, and the enforcement of the laws of this country, in which he charged me with making pro-German statements and disloyal conduct. Returning, through a mutual friend, I asked him in a letter to correct his statements, as I believed that he had been misinformed, and also to correct the statement he made in regard to the legislation which I had tendered. You will remember that that letter was read in my first reply. You will remember that he declined to make a correction of the Record, but insisted on leaving the statements as they were. I do not apologize to the House for taking this time in replying to his last speech, for, as I stated yesterday, if he would correct the Record in places where he had misquoted my last speech on Alsace-Lorraine, I would gladly accept any terms whereby this controversy might end. I gave notice that I would continue to resent any insulting insinuations reflecting upon my Americanism, from whatever source it might come, and I propose to keep my promise. Now, that same man on April the 23d has again assumed the position of censor, and insinuates that I am not as good an American as he is, and as he assumes in his speeches to tell the Republicans of Illinois what to do in my case, and has notified me that he will come to Chicago to take care of my case, I claim the privilege not only of replying to his insinuating remarks but to place before the people of my State something of the record of this self-appointed censor in order that my people may know just who he is and what he is. He complains that I made my speech of April the 7th in his absence. I did that, and will do it again under the same circumstances, for with that bravery that is characteristic of cowardice he made his insulting speech in regard to me late in the afternoon of the 6th, when, as shown by the statement of the gentleman who spoke for him, he knew he was going away that night and that it was impossible for me to get the floor until the next day. If he had the least conception of legislative courtesy, this would not have happened. He had a month to reply to my speech. I was ready to reply to him the minute he closed, and as soon as I found I could get the floor the next morning, from the Republican cloakroom I notified his office that I would reply to him, and I did not know that he had left the city until after I had taken the floor. I wish my people to know another evidence of his bravery and honesty.

The speech he made, which was sent broadcast over the United States, insulting me in reflecting on my Americanism, was made three weeks ago, and he waited 21 days before printing it in the Record. When he comes to Illinois to tell our people what to do—and I hope it is a promise and not a threat—he will be most heartily welcomed; but as I know something of the wisdom of the Democratic committee in Illinois, he will have to hire a hall on his own account if he comes. [Laughter.]

I wish the people to know also, when he comes to our State to run the politics of Illinois, that this is the same gentleman who in the last Congress was forced by a committee to print what did happen in place of what he said happened. I was not then a Member, but in his colloquy with our colleague, Mr. RAGSDALE, he deliberately shifted the word "applause" so as to help him and to injure Mr. RAGSDALE. He corrected this only when confronted by the statement of the Official Reporter, and was compelled by the committee appointed by this House to let the Record be printed showing the alterations he had made overnight. He did this to help himself politically. If there had been money or other things of value involved, it would have been a crime. When he comes to Illinois to bellow about his patriotism and my lack of it, I want the people to know that he is the man who assisted the Kaiser by intimating that his colleagues in that Congress had been influenced by the Bernstorff fund, which was not only false and slanderous to his colleagues and not only encouraged the Kaiser but discouraged the American people, who did not believe that that Congress was for sale. When before the committee for these charges he crawled, denied the statement as to the gambling house, although two or more reputable reporters testified that he did make the statement.

Mr. HEFLIN rose.

The CHAIRMAN. Does the gentleman from Illinois yield to the gentleman from Alabama?

Mr. MASON. I shall not yield for a question.

Mr. HEFLIN. I make the point of order.

The CHAIRMAN. The gentleman will state it.

Mr. HEFLIN. I merely want to state, Mr. Chairman, that I am not going to interrupt—

The CHAIRMAN. What is the point of order that the gentleman desires to make?

Mr. HEFLIN. The point of order is that the gentleman said—

The CHAIRMAN. If the gentleman desires to make a point of order, he should state it. The gentleman from Illinois has declined to yield.

Mr. HEFLIN. I am doing my best to tell the Chair what I am going to make the point of order about.

The CHAIRMAN. The gentleman will state it.

Mr. HEFLIN. The gentleman was making a statement that I had slandered Members of the House, and my point of order is that under the rules you can not charge those things, but I shall not interrupt—

The CHAIRMAN. Does the gentleman desire these words taken down?

Mr. HEFLIN. I just want to ask the Republican side not to bother me when I come to reply.

The CHAIRMAN. The gentleman does not state a point of order.

Mr. MASON. Driven into a corner, he finally said he "suspected"—he, the magnificent, self-appointed Pecksniff—suspected 12 or 14 of his colleagues in that Congress. He admitted that he had no evidence against them, and declining to give any evidence except his own foul suspicion he appeared before the investigating committee, within two days of the close of the session, and when threatened with expulsion he said before the committee: "Do you think the Commander in Chief of the Army and Navy would permit you to humiliate me?" [Laughter.] Brave boy, who soaks you with a snowball and then runs into the schoolhouse. Brave boy, who challenges you for a scrap, and the first time he gets a punch in the face halloo for the teacher. It was near the close of the session; the committee reported unanimously that his conduct deserved censure. He expected a vote on expulsion, and long after Congress had adjourned, and the Members gone home, he exercised his privilege by printing in the Record pages of newspaper articles which he adopted as a part of his remarks, one of which referred to the remarkable scandal which he had theretofore stated he knew nothing about. But seeking to gather a little cheap politics for himself and to scandalize his colleagues, he relished the whole thing, as if his charges against his colleagues were true and that he had reasons for suspicions, and that he would name the 14 suspects, which up to this time he has never had the clear grit to do.

As to the Age-Herald and his suggestion that I was in some sort of conspiracy with that paper and with the Senator who is running to succeed himself from Alabama, in answer to that I will simply say that the editorial was handed to me by my Republican colleague. I did not know of the second editorial. He says he wrote, "HEFLIN holds House rapt," but paid for sending it. "O Modesty, thy first name is Thomas." My charge that he is playing cheap politics is supported by the fact that he does not deny that he wrote the startling headline of his speech, "HEFLIN holds the House rapt." When you stop to consider that "rapt" means "transport, ecstasy" it will hardly be necessary to raise the veracity of that report, nor is it really necessary to discuss the question of whether he was moved to write these glaring headlines of his own eloquence by patriotism or paresis. [Laughter.]

I did not know at the time I made that speech that he was possessed of enough gall to announce himself for United States Senator for the State of Alabama. So I could not have been in any conspiracy to injure him in his politics, while he stated that he had never had any opposition, and the statement that he is playing cheap politics is borne out by the fact that his speech assailing me, a Republican, in order to build himself up among the Democrats, was so that he could say to his constituents, "I have not only done my best to kill a negro in Washington, but, like the knights of old, I have walked down the Halls of Congress and flung my shining lance full and free at an old fellow, who is a Yankee Republican." He will say to them that he has got all his colleagues scared, and even has defied the Democratic leader, and given notice that the Speaker was not fair. He will say, "I have got everybody locoed and scared to death in Congress, except one Illinois Republican, and I am going after him." When he is abusing me to make votes for himself, will not some one of your fair men down in Alabama tell him that when I was a boy, standing guard at night and nursing the wounded in the daytime, I had all the prejudices of our side that you had on your side, but after I had lived in the big, broad city of Chicago

and traveled in politics a few years and came to this House 32 years ago and served with great Democrats like Sam Randall, Carlisle, Crisp of Georgia, and of scores of others that I can not name, I had a broader vision of what my country meant.

Once in Paris, in a theater, I was lonesome, could not understand the language; but when the band struck up the tune of "Dixie" my hands burned in starting the applause.

I knew that I had gotten over my sectionalism and that "Dixie" was as much my land as yours. [Applause.] And I want to say to you that when he seeks to prejudice you against me on account of that you may remember that when an effort was made to erect a monument to the Confederate dead in Chicago, the first northern city that ever did that, I defended it here and received the abuse of small men, as I am receiving it to-day, because I thought that was a patriotic thing to do. I contributed in my small way, and Chicago unveiled the first monument, and the Grand Army of the Republic stood back of me and with me—the men who fought the men in gray. I just simply want you to know that while I am a Republican, and I have defended the economic principles of that party all of my life and expect to do it until I die, yet I never have appealed for the past 25 years at least to sectionalism to support either myself or the principles of my party. [Applause.] I did say that he was doing cheap politics, but at that time I did not realize how cheap it was—I did not realize how cheap it was until from his district and from his State they sent me his announcement as a candidate for the Senatorship, and the cheapness consists in the fact that it is an unfrankable communication, in my opinion, and he is sending it out at Government expense! That is what I call real cheap politics. [Laughter.] I am not going to read it all, and I shall not put it into the Record, for then he would be justified in mailing it by the tons. On March 9 he says:

DEAR SIR: I am being urged by my people in every section of the State to become a candidate for the Senate.

[Laughter.]

I hope gentlemen will not laugh. It is one of those serious things—to Alabama. [Laughter.]

And all I wish to say about that is, Mr. Chairman, that I did not know that when I charged him with cheap politics. I say now that there is not a thing in that letter that makes it frankable, and there is no other gentleman upon the floor of this House who sends out political announcements, and sends them out at the expense of his Government, by simply inserting at the bottom an extract from the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD from Senator SIMMONS, who comments, not unfairly, but who comments upon the amendment known as the Bankhead amendment. Now, I suggest to you gentlemen, any of you who want to avoid payment of your just taxes to the Government we love, and we all love our Government, if you want to avoid paying your political postage, I suggest a letter like this:

DEAR BOB: I am going to run for reelection, and I want you to see Dick and tell him to look after the fourth ward, and tell Harry to look after the floating vote, and get Bill to keep after the lawsuit and get it settled. Mary and the children are all well. Love to all the boys.

Yours,

JIM.

P. S. The following is from the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD of April 16, 1918: "HEFLIN holds House rap."

[Applause.]

He said here the other day, and I have no doubt it is true, that he is willing to die for his country; but, brother, do not die, but live long enough to fix up this little postage account with your Uncle Sam. One of my colleagues suggested that for his campaign he have some pictures painted of himself, holding in his right hand the American flag and his left hand in Uncle Sam's pocket looking for postage stamps. [Laughter and applause on the Republican side.] I remember the day, on the 5th of April, 1917, when the Democratic leader of the House, Mr. KITCHIN, had been pointed out to me, and when this great censor said that he "regretted" to say some things, and then, after lecturing the leader, said that he ought to resign as a Member of the House, and he looked so pretty, and sounded so patriotic, and spoke with such authority I inquired of one of my colleagues who he was, and whether he was the leader over there; and he smiled and said, "That is HEFLIN; he thinks he is the Government." But he says he is only dealing with me on account of my speeches here, and yet he closes his dodging and insulting arguments "that I am a walking advertisement for nuxated iron." He puts it in the Record, thereby making it a free advertisement hereafter. [Laughter.] His was a high and lofty purpose. I want to state to you that I wrote the letter that was used as an advertisement. I am not apologizing or explaining or justifying the question of taste, but I wrote it; but to use the language of Sir Walter Raleigh, "I did not dream that so frail a note would attract attention of the 'gun toter' from Alabama."

I quit lying a good many years ago, not only on account of its immorality but it is such a strain on the memory. [Laughter and applause.] I heard Willie Collier a few nights ago in "Tell the Truth." I am determined to stick to it. I wrote the letter, I told the truth about that particular remedy. I wish I could find words in parliamentary language to tell the truth about one particular Member of this body—I mention no names.

But our brave and distinguished friend says in a trembling voice that he tendered his services to the President the day after war was declared. I can see him walking up Pennsylvania Avenue, walking in the center of the street to maintain the equilibrium of the street and in the interest of the passers-by on the sidewalk, and knocking at the White House door, and the conversation was probably something like this:

"THE PRESIDENT. What can I do for you?"

This is an imaginary conversation, and see if it is borne out by the record—

"I want to be a soldier and with the soldiers stand,

A safety pin upon my shoulder and a six-gun in my hand"—

For you know he is given to poetry at times, at least he thinks it is poetry. And the President says:

"Why, how did you dodge the recruiting officers down here? There are three or four between here and your place. I suppose you come of fighting stock?" "Yes, sir." "Your forefathers were in the Confederate Army?" "No, sir; they were not." "I understand you made a fine record in the Spanish War?" "Oh, no, Mr. President; there was no draft in that war." [Laughter on the Republican side.] "If I had volunteered there would have been nobody here to protect you against this wicked Congress." "Well, brother, they tell me there are three or four Republicans who are going to enlist in Congress and I suppose they can tell you how to get in. Were you down on the Mexican border in that scrap?" "Oh, no; I was busy." "You were busy?" "Yes." "You were for it?" "Yes; I am for every scrap I can keep out of." Now, I want you gentlemen to know I did not bring this into the Record, I did not bring into the Record the question of his fortune or misfortune in having shot somebody in Washington. I did not bring it in here. He brought it in; but I say the President might have said to him very naturally, "Are you the man who shot at a black man and hit a white man?" And he would say, "Yes." That is what he told us here the other day, and the President would naturally say, "I do not think you will do, brother. If I sent you out with a long-range gun and directed you to blow up Berlin you would hit Tokyo." [Laughter and applause on the Republican side.] The gentleman says, striking an attitude here, "I have no newspaper in Alabama, but I have the ear of the people of Alabama." If Alabama has a friend here, please telegraph that grand old Commonwealth—that has given us men like Morgan, Pettis, Fighting Joe Wheeler—please telegraph Alabama that HEFLIN has their ear, and they had better get it back or it may go where Uncle Sam's postage has gone.

Mr. Chairman, when I mention cheap politics I consider that rather cheap. Mr. Chairman, I called his attention to the fact that I had not mentioned that shooting scrape down on Pennsylvania Avenue. I did not mention it, although I knew about it. I have examined the court record, and I find that he was indicted or arrested way back in 1908, held to await the action of the grand jury, and the indictments were carried along some eight years—August, 1916—up to and after the last Democratic national convention those cases were not pressed—at least one was. I do not know the facts about this matter, and I am not competent to pass on it, but when he stands here and brings it in for the purpose of making political capital in Alabama, and says that he did it in defense of a white woman who was being insulted by a negro, I have only, Mr. Chairman, to say this: If that is a fact, a jury in the District of Columbia would have acquitted him in 24 hours. It was not necessary to continue the cases for eight years before they were not pressed. [Applause on the Republican side.]

Now, I want to say this: I did not intend to mention it. He brought it in. I am accommodating him by giving him the benefit of that in his State for politics. I consider it rather small politics. But when he comes to Chicago to tell the people of my State what to do with me, as he threatens to do, the law-abiding citizens there may inquire why he had to "tote" a gun in the dangerous days of 1908, and I will explain to them, so that he will not be embarrassed. Washington in those days was in a dangerous state, as school children were likely to snowball you at any moment. Twice I have been snowballed by the children of the people of Washington. [Laughter.] And you go into many houses and you will pass a great big globe of goldfish, and they are liable to snap your arm off at any

time. [Laughter.] And over here in our great office building, when we open our desks, we are liable to meet at any moment the flashing eye and open mouth of a bull cockroach. [Laughter.]

He suggested he was willing to meet me. I do not know in what sort of an encounter, but if it is a matter of physical encounter I will have to decline. I am not a fighting man. When it comes to either pugilism or beauty, I am not in his class. I learned some years after I was 60 years of age my physical limitations, and if the gentleman had some honest friend to inform him as to his intellectual limitations he might be persuaded to let up on his perpetual lecture tour. He speaks truly of his own beauty; that is, he thinks he is a beauty. Some day he may be disillusionized. In the beauty market I could not hope to compete with him. I realize that it is the peacock that is the beautiful bird, but it takes a stork to deliver the goods. [Applause and laughter.]

In regard to the speech I made on Alsace-Lorraine, he has deliberately garbled it and misconstrued it. The President of the United States, within a few days after that speech, delivered his last great message to Congress and abandoned by "omission" the idea that the return of Alsace-Lorraine was an American demand as terms of peace. And when Mr. HEFLIN assails me on that question he assails the President of the United States. More than that, it is an assault upon the intelligence of all who sit in this Chamber. I said repeatedly in that speech that we would not stop a moment in our preparations for war; that we would not abandon our league of honor. I defended the administration against the assault of persons in his own party. I submitted my suggestions "not in criticism, but in a friendly spirit of humility." It was so received by every Member of the House except Mr. HEFLIN, and his speech showed clearly that he has not the brains to comprehend the question discussed, or he has deliberately and willfully misstated my position as a part of his cheap political game.

I quote to you now exactly what I said, to show you how in his speech, that has been sent all over my State in the newspapers, he makes me say exactly what I did not say, as if he had struck out the word "not" and made an affirmative instead of a negative statement. You know the delicacy of the situation. Why discuss it? This is what I said:

We must not stop or hold up one bit in our preparations in the prosecution of this war and it would be barbarism to refuse to discuss peace. We will not abandon one moment the league of honor in which we, with our coworkers, fight the Imperial Government of Germany.

Now, this is what Mr. HEFLIN says I said, and to make it worse he puts it in quotations as coming from me:

"The gentleman from Illinois," quoting from his speech, "endeavors to halt your forces. It is barbarous not to stop and discuss peace terms. Let us stop and parley with him."

That is exactly what I did not say. How long am I to be silent? And how long will you stand conduct of this kind from gentlemen who will deliberately change the substance of what you have said and put it in the Record, and then, by reason of the fact that some unfriendly newspaper in a State is willing to print it, convey a wrong impression? I will be glad to discuss that question with him at any time, but the hour for discussion of that is past. The President in his statement omitted any such demand as a part of the American policy.

The gentleman from Alabama boasted that by reason of nagging he has compelled me to change the tone of my speech. He thinks I wish to submit to his canary-bird intelligence my thoughts before telling them to my colleagues. I voted against the declaration of war in obedience to my sense of duty, and I am surprised that any man can get into Congress who can not appreciate the point of view and vision of a man who willingly surrenders his judgment in the cause of his country. We go into political conventions, and when defeated we surrender and follow out the wishes of the party. We ought to be big enough when we are in this Congress to express our honest convictions, as I try to do, and when the Congress voted me down and voted in favor, I have stood for the enforcement of the laws, and I have surrendered my private opinion under the dictates of my conscience and in the performance of my duty. [Applause.] And why should I not? My forefathers have fought in every war for this country, and no man of my blood has ever fired on this flag.

And you will pardon me if, before I sit down—

The CHAIRMAN. The time of the gentleman has expired.

Mr. DAVIS. I yield to the gentleman five minutes more.

Mr. MASON. I say that I dislike to put these things again in the Record, and I do it not wholly as a matter of self-defense, but in justice to the people of my State who sent me here. I have voted my conscience. I was against conscription, but when the conscription law was passed, at every place, public or private, I have stood for the enforcement of the law, because it was a law of my country, and yet this gentleman tries to

make it appear in his speech that I was trying to hinder the early sending of troops over there, when there is not any justification for any such charge. In every place where I have been called upon—and, I say, I hope you will forgive me for again putting it in the Record, but I am doing it for my own people, who do not know the man who made this assault upon me—I gave willingly and I sent the only son left at home. He did not go to the White House; he did not telegraph me to get him a commission. He enlisted as a private soldier, within 10 blocks of where he was born, and with my consent and his family's consent. He is not afraid of bullets. [Applause.] I do not know why his dad should be afraid of bullies. [Applause.] I am not. I would be an unworthy sire of an American soldier if I were. I have my views about the American flag. It should be worn in the heart and not in the mouth, and this great flag of ours, that has made the world anew and will continue to keep it so, should be to all Americans a heart stimulant and not a mouth wash. [Laughter.] It should be my flag as much as his. I am willing to make any sacrifice, and I shall resent, as I have here, in public or private, at a funeral or a feast, the charges of anyone who reflects upon my Americanism or charges me with disloyalty to the country that my fathers fought for and that my son is now fighting for. [Loud applause.]

The CHAIRMAN. The gentleman from Mississippi [Mr. Sisson] is recognized.

Mr. Sisson. Mr. Chairman, I yield 30 minutes to the gentleman from Alabama [Mr. HEFLIN].

The CHAIRMAN. The gentleman from Alabama is recognized for 30 minutes.

Mr. HEFLIN. Mr. Chairman and gentlemen of the House, I do not intend that this case shall be switched off onto vermin and nuxated iron or made into a nuxated-iron cross which has been conferred, according to Collier's Weekly, upon the gentleman from Illinois [Mr. Mason]. I have nothing personal in this matter at all, Mr. Chairman.

The gentleman refers here to my statement last fall that there were 13 or 14 men in Congress whose conduct had been suspicious. That was true. I asked permission upon this floor three times to name them. There were some Democrats among them as well as Republicans. I want to say, though, that there are more than 400 men in this body who have never said or done one thing since war was declared that was not in keeping with the highest and best interests of the country; and when I am taken to task by the gentleman from Illinois for criticizing a speech that he made here February 7, I am representing you, patriotic Republicans, and you, patriotic Democrats. Should I permit that speech to go unchallenged when I heard part of it—he extended his remarks in the Record as to the other part, and I read it afterwards. I submitted it to others to see if they got the same impression that I did, and they all said it was wrong and ought to be answered. Mr. Chairman, I made up my mind when I came back here, when Congress reconvened in December, to let that old matter drop; to say nothing about the letters that I had received from the districts of these gentlemen; nothing about the comment of papers published in their own States. I decided to close it up, and I told my friends I had, and they said I was right. But I said, "If any one of them starts a new attack, I am going to answer him."

The gentleman from Illinois, in a speech here in February, was the first one to make such an attack. In his speech here to-day he complains among other things that I misquoted him. The quotations that he mentions here purporting to have come from me, with quotation marks around them, were not placed there by me. I was speaking in the usual way of debate, and said the gentleman said, "Hold your forces; let us discuss peace." I did not say that he said that literally, although that was the meaning of his suggestion.

Now, the gentleman speaks of writing me a letter on a former occasion, that if I did not correct certain things he was going to take me to task, and that he had done so. That was before Congress had adjourned, and I decided to let all of those things go. He says now that I have assumed the position of censor. No more than any other patriotic Member of this House. I think it is my duty to criticize the conduct that I believe does not represent my country correctly now and before the bar of posterity, and when I single out a speech that I am going to bring to your attention later that the gentleman makes upon this floor which I believe is extremely detrimental, injurious, and one which misrepresents my country's position in this war I am entitled to have the support of every patriotic Republican on that side. I regretted the other day that the gentleman from Pennsylvania [Mr. Moore] heckled me and did all in his power to keep me from discussing that speech and telling just what it was that the gentleman from Illinois had said. I re-

gretted also that the gentleman from New York [Mr. SNYDER] objected to giving me time to discuss that speech which had attacked my country and misrepresented its position in the war with Germany. I regretted to find that there was anyone on that side that would do that. I know that there are a few of them. Gentlemen, I say again in your presence that the great body of you are as loyal and as patriotic as I am or as anybody on this side. [Applause.] And I will say more than that, the Republican Illinois delegation in this House will not indorse that speech. Foss, of Illinois, will not indorse it. McKINLEY and McKENZIE and CANNON will not indorse it. I challenge him to write and present to them a statement saying, "We, the undersigned Members of the delegation from Illinois, indorse these sentiments and statements contained in that speech." I challenge him to do that. I challenge him to get the Republican side, as many as one-fifth of your number, to indorse it, and then talk to me about undertaking to play politics!

The gentleman suggests that a portion of my speech was sent to Illinois. I never sent it, although he sent his gas attack upon me in this House during my absence—a product or result of nuxated iron. [Applause.] That was sent, the entire speech, down to Alabama to the Age-Herald; a little Alabama politics, by way of Illinois. [Laughter.] God of our fathers, what are we coming to in Alabama? [Laughter.] The paper said that the Republican membership, supplemented by a few Democrats, instructed the Clerk of the House to send it down and have it printed, prepaid. I find upon investigation that no Democrat had anything to do with it, but if anyone did he belongs to that list of 13 or 14 that I had in mind last fall. [Laughter.] No loyal Democrat had anything to do with it, and no loyal Republican had anything to do with it. I can name them by the score that never had a thing to do with it. Why did they want to put that on the Republican Party? Then, I asked the Clerk of the House, "Did the Republican membership and a few Democrats ask you to send it?" He said, "No; I never heard of such a thing."

So you see none of this thing ever happened. The gentleman from Illinois [Mr. MASON] said in his speech that cruel Democrats bought that speech that I am criticizing by the thousands. I find upon investigation that no Democrat had a single copy of it printed, and no Republican—no Member but himself—had copies printed, so the RECORD clerk informs me. Now, then, somebody has been careless with the facts of this situation or is just straying off after a little dose of nuxated iron. [Laughter.]

Now, I am not going to take up my time in going into the immaterial things. I must mention one thing here. The gentleman talks about me having a difficulty with a negro man in Washington a few years ago. The gentleman from Wisconsin [Mr. COOPER] is the first man, as I recall, who ever made reference to that occurrence on this floor. I replied to that showing how some people were trying to nag, worry, and annoy me because I am trying to perform my patriotic duty in this body.

Now, Mr. Chairman, I am going to tell gentlemen here briefly what happened in regard to that matter. I introduced a jim-crow car bill in the House. We discussed it one afternoon. Next morning I received 30 or 40 anonymous letters from negroes, I suppose, threatening my life. I talked with several friends about it and they said, "If you have a pistol, you carry it, for they will assault you; they cut a white boy from Maryland down at the Peace Monument the other night, and you had better be on the lookout." When this negro, drunk and cursing, insulted a white woman on a street car in my presence, a working girl in the Post Office Department, I resented it, and in the difficulty had to shoot him finally, and one shot struck a white man in the leg.

I cared for the white man. I had two trained nurses with him for weeks and, in all, five physicians and surgeons; and they saved his life. It cost me \$2,000 to defend that white girl from the insults and insolence of the drunken negro, but I do not regret my act on that occasion or a dollar of the money that it cost me. [Applause.]

That is not all. The gentleman says that a Republican handed him the Age-Herald editorial read by him here before. Doubtless, I will tell you about this woman defended by me on the street car. A Republican told her that if she testified for me she would lose her job in the Post Office Department. When the case was about ready to be tried they speeded her off to the Philippine Islands without consulting me. I did not know that she had gone. She wrote me a letter from a foreign port and said that she had been sent over there to work in the Post Office Department in the Philippine Islands and would not be here to testify. She wrote me a very touching letter and said, if I wanted her to, that she would have her deposition taken and sent over here, and she said, "I will never forget your kindness

and protection of me." These are the efforts of some Republicans of the gentleman's type to keep justice from being done me in the case I have mentioned. The grand jury by which I was indicted had more than a half dozen negroes upon it. The case was pushed by certain Republican politicians in Washington at that time, who tried to make me suffer. But I knew I was right in protecting the woman as I did. Does the gentleman indorse that?

Now, Mr. Speaker, I am coming to the issue. Cicero, I believe it was, told his friend, "When you find yourself under a serious charge and the facts are all against you, make them forget the charge and the facts if you can." That is what the gentleman from Illinois is undertaking to do here to-day.

I honor his boy who fights for my country. God bless him as he goes to the firing line. But I will say this for the benefit of the gentleman, that after his boy had enlisted the gentleman introduced a bill here to keep the boy from reaching the firing line.

Mr. MASON. That is not true.

The CHAIRMAN. Does the gentleman from Alabama yield to the gentleman from Illinois?

Mr. HEFLIN. Yes. Did not the gentleman introduce a bill to keep the President from taking the Army out of the country?

Mr. MASON. No.

Mr. HEFLIN. What was your bill?

Mr. MASON. It provided for volunteers to be sent there, and my son was a volunteer. [Applause.]

Mr. HEFLIN. Only a volunteer. Then the gentleman is not at all responsible for the boy being in the Army; his boy went in in spite of him if a volunteer. He did not have anything to do with it. But his bill was to tie the hands of the Army and keep the President from taking it out of the country unless each soldier said, "I am willing to go."

I was not going to refer to that. That is a thing of the past. But I will tell you what happened concerning the bill. The pro-German Vierick, notoriously against this Government and for Germany, indorsed this Mason bill and somebody sent petitions all over the country saying, "Vote for the Mason bill to repeal the selective draft." That is what the petition said, whether you call it that or not. "Vote for the Mason bill, which repeals the selective draft." But I was willing to let that go by and bring him down to this speech that he made here in February. Let me get to that. Now, gentlemen, give me your attention.

This is what he said:

Those who are willing and anxious to continue to give the lives of every American and every dollar of American money to transfer the territory of one nation to another will not be here to vote—

And so forth.

Is this country in the attitude of doing that—sending boys over there to transfer the territory of one nation to another?

I denounce that statement as one that does not represent my country's position in this war.

Another one:

The people of the United States are patient. There will be no riots that will shake our Government, for they know that in the cool, quiet days of next November they will be permitted to speak upon questions of life and death about which heretofore they have been silent.

Gentlemen of the House, what did he mean by that statement? What did he mean by insinuating that the people of the United States would not riot? Was there any occasion to make that speech here in February of this year, when our boys were fighting over yonder? Is there any other honest interpretation that you can put upon it except that they do not indorse their country's program and that they will repudiate it? What other meaning can be attributed to it? Gentlemen, is that the right kind of a note to be sounding at a time like this?

What is the next statement in that speech? I will read:

The people in the last analysis govern Congress, and if the people do not govern this one they will the next one.

Now, what did he mean by that? This is the Congress that declared war. This is the Congress that passed the selective-draft bill. This is the Congress that refused to pass his bill, and keeps it lying in the pigeonhole where it belongs. And yet he says that if the people do not control this one they will the next one. Now, listen to this next statement from that speech:

For God's sake let us quit conserving the truth and give out a little of that old-fashioned commodity. The truth is that the thing that stands in the way of peace to-day, that peace that would solve all of these questions that confront us, and which have put us in trouble, is what disposition shall be made of Alsace-Lorraine.

Gentlemen, does that statement represent the facts of your position and mine? Does that represent the truth of the American Government's position in this war? Is that what is behind the boys gone out of my district and yours to fight and die on the battle front in France? No; it misrepresents my country's

position. It is inexcusable and indefensible and deserves to be repudiated by this House. Does it speak your views? Do you indorse that? I am not talking about whether the gentleman wants to run for election in Illinois, or whether I should run for the Senate. I have never said I would run for the Senate, but if I do run I will expect and desire to receive only the loyal American vote. I do not want any other kind of vote. No Potsdamer has got any comfort out of any position that I have taken here, any vote that I have cast, or any speech that I have made. I am for my country against Germany in this war. [Applause.]

Let me read again from that speech:

But, Mr. Chairman, I did not intend to discuss, and shall not discuss further, the solution of the greatest stumbling block in our way to an honorable peace.

Gentleman, he is still speaking of Alsace-Lorraine. Do you regard this as a matter to be lightly cast aside? Should a speech like that turn up in the Record in the years to come and some man read it and say, "Did you ever read that speech made by MASON, of Illinois? Why, he says that our position is that we were over there fighting to transfer territory from one nation to another, and that we fought on when the only question at issue was the disposition of Alsace-Lorraine. Gentlemen, do you want to stand for that in the Record? Gentlemen, listen. I read another statement from the speech that I have criticized:

Since the publication of the secret treaties between our allies we have discovered that when we went to war for democracy our good friends, the English, the Russians, and the French, had agreed just how our English cousins and our French brothers were to slice up Germany, and that noble democrat, the Czar of Russia, was to have a slice of Turkey. We have also learned by the publication of the secret treaties that if we were successful in our fight for democracy that the King of Italy, that great commoner, could turn down the Pope and become sovereign over the farmers of a part of Austria.

Gentlemen, what is the tendency or leaning of the thought in that statement? Which side does it lean to? Does it pull and draw us closer and closer to our allies and them to us; does it contribute to unity of purpose and concerted action between us? No; it assails and attacks the position of our allies who are fighting with us for existence and for liberty. That is what it does. The gentleman says that they had such an agreement when we went into fight for democracy, and that we are fighting with men who want to slice up Germany, and the inference is that that is what we are over there fighting for now. Is there any other meaning to it but that? Gentlemen, is there anything personal in this? There is nothing personal about it with me. If I know my own heart, I am fighting for my country and for a correct statement of her position before the world. [Applause.] This does not correctly state it. Now, did he say in that speech what the President had said, that this war was begun by the military masters of Germany? Did he say what the President said, that Germany dragged us into this war, and that we could not remain out without being dishonored and disgraced? [Applause.] No; he does not say that. He nags at the allies. He talks about the only thing that stands between us and peace, when our very existence is at stake. And yet some gentlemen on that side sit and cheer the gentleman, which shows, I presume, that they indorse the stand that he takes in this speech. That will be a question for them to settle before their constituents this fall.

Now, I read further from that speech:

And some of you maybe were surprised when you discovered that our good friend, the Mikado, who does not want to own land in this country or send his children to the schools of California and does not want the Sandwich Islands or the Philippine Islands, and who while in our fight for democracy has not found it convenient to send a man or a ship to help us while we are helping him. I say some of you may have been surprised that our Japanese friends, while expecting our assistance in this fight for democracy, had a secret treaty with the great democrat, the Czar, whereby they were to fight your Uncle Sam in the Far East in case action should arise and we need the whipping.

Why that suggestion at a time like this? Japan is an ally of England, one of our great allies. Why should anything be said to reflect upon Japan?

Is there anything in this about Germany, about the murder of the Archduke and Duchess of Austria as a pretense and excuse to begin the war? Is there anything about the Kaiser saying "On to Paris and world dominion"? No. Anything about the Crown Prince telling Gerard they had 500,000 reservists that could strike this country down before it could raise an Army? No. Anything about the spies right here in Washington and over the country blowing up munition plants, destroying our property, and inciting sedition and treason amongst the people? No. Nagging at the allies, nagging at Japan, England, France, Russia, Italy? My God! What greater contribution could be made to the enemies of the Government than such suggestions as those. Do gentlemen here stand for that? Do you indorse that? Here is another statement from that speech, speaking of the mothers of America:

They know, if they have been through high school that never before in the history of the United States have Americans been conscripted to settle ancient questions pending between other nations.

My God; such a statement! I was in my district week before last and a mother who works in the cotton factory at Lanett came up after my speech in the interest of the liberty loan, shook my hand, and said, "Mr. HEFLIN, I want to thank you for your speech and for what you are doing for our boys. I have got one in France already and I have another who will go if necessary as soon as he is old enough"; and the tears were in her eyes as she spoke, and I thought as I came away, My God; was there ever a more full and complete heart offering than that of a mother presenting her boy at the altar of her country—and then sit silent when a speech is made here saying that American mothers who have been through high school know that never before were boys conscripted to go and fight to settle ancient questions pending between other nations! Is that what we are fighting for? The President of the United States said, "We are fighting for the rights and the liberty of the American people." "American sovereignty is at stake," and that "to withhold our hand was to dishonor the flag." But here is an insinuation that our boys are being conscripted to fight to settle disputes between other nations. My God, gentlemen, were you willing for that speech to go down to posterity unchallenged, unanswered? I am not; and that is the sole purpose of my attacking it before and again here to-day.

The gentleman has read what the papers said about me. I gave him notice the other day that I hated to refer to newspaper comments upon him, but the Chicago Herald, in his own State, says of him that his attitude has affronted the patriotism of the Nation. I am not saying it. The Chicago Post, another Republican paper, says of him that he is a German-helping Congressman. I did not say that, and I asked him before not to make me say these things upon the floor, but I am now like he said of himself—I dare to do my duty here if it cost me my life.

The gentleman says that I do not know a recruiting station when I see it. I may not be able to recognize a recruiting station, but I can not be deceived about a Potsdamer. [Laughter.] The gentleman says that I would not be able to hit a German on the firing line. I may not be able to hit a German on the firing line in France, but I shoot with unerring precision at the bull's-eye of slackness and sedition in Washington. [Applause.] I can not be deceived by the waving of hands that resemble those of the American Esau, for I recognize the voice of the German Jacob. [Laughter.]

So much for that. Another paper says that Gov. Lowden was called over there to take charge of a meeting where the gentleman was to speak for pacifists. Does that look like he was contributing to our cause? I have got the newspaper article right here. Gov. Lowden came himself to take charge of the situation, the paper says—the governor of Illinois. No governor of my State has ever been called to a meeting where I went to make a speech, except to applaud the patriotism of my speech. No paper in my State or out of it has ever challenged my loyalty or questioned my patriotism. Here is what the Omaha Nebraskan said about the situation here last fall:

Every Kaiser booster in the House took occasion to join in the abuse of HEFLIN, the 100 per cent American from Alabama.

That is what the papers say about me, and I have read what the gentleman's own papers say about him. Here is another one. The Gazette, of York, Pa., says:

Congressman HEFLIN has consistently been a loyal American.

Here is what the Birmingham News says:

All through those months antedating the war, and even after the declaration, there were congressional speeches attacking methods of the administration, speeches with double meanings, delicate turning and twisting of sentences that might easily have been attributed to Germanic influences. Through all that mêlée of strange tongues TOM HEFLIN, of Alabama, was at the forefront of the fighting in defense of clean, outspoken, thoroughgoing Americanism.

[Applause.]

That is what the papers of my State say about me, and I have given you what the Chicago Post and the Chicago Herald, Republican papers, said about the gentleman from Illinois. I have some letters here about the gentleman, but I will not take the time to read them now. Mr. Chairman, how much time have I remaining?

THE CHAIRMAN. The gentleman has just about one-half minute.

Mr. HEFLIN. I will ask the gentleman to yield me a little more time.

Mr. SISSON. I yield the gentleman five minutes more.

Mr. HEFLIN. Wisconsin has had a house cleaning. The legislature of that State by resolution has repudiated one who has not measured up to the standard of American loyalty in that State. The people at the polls have repudiated Berger and

elected a loyal man, LENROOT, to the Senate from Wisconsin. [Applause.] I hope this fall to see every disloyal Republican on that side beaten and every disloyal Democrat on this side beaten.

I would not go into the district of a Republican who has been loyal here, if that is the issue, and help somebody to beat him, and I will not go into the district of a Democrat who has got a yellow streak in him and ask them to return him at the next election. I will say to the House that if I had my way about it there are two or three or four on either side here that I would not vote for for reelection. I will say that to you frankly. I am not playing any favorites in this matter. There are a few in here on both sides that if I had my way about I would not return them to the House.

But, gentlemen, let me say this in conclusion: I know that the heart of this House is loyal to that flag; I know that the newspaper boys who sit in that gallery, nearly all of them, with the possible exception of a very few, are just as loyal as I am and as you are. I am fighting for the boys at the front; I am fighting for my country if I know my own heart. Let gentlemen criticize me personally—I am ready to take it—but I want to stand squarely by my people and by my country and be able to say that I did what I could to close up the ranks in this House. I want to make my contribution in this time of war to the complete solidarity of the American people. [Applause.] That is my position, and the gentleman's speech that I have here criticized is not in keeping with that position. It misrepresents my country's position; it is inexcusable and indefensible and ought never to have been made in this House. Now, if the gentleman wants to go along hereafter standing by us and with us all down the line, I welcome him to the ranks. I do not want him to assail my country and its position, or anybody on that side, or anybody on this side. If he rises on this side I will criticize him; if he comes up on that side again, so help me God, I will criticize him.

Gentlemen, let us stand together, all together, behind the President of the United States. America no longer held together by outward force and barriers, but bound together by the ties of love and loyalty, and the cling of section to section—one heart, one country, one flag, America—incarnated spirit of liberty and power in the hands of God to prevent democracy and liberty from perishing from the earth. [Loud applause.]

Mr. DAVIS. Mr. Chairman, I yield to the gentleman from Illinois [Mr. GRAHAM] 35 minutes.

Mr. GRAHAM of Illinois. Mr. Chairman, a parliamentary inquiry.

The CHAIRMAN. The gentleman will state it.

Mr. GRAHAM of Illinois. Can I yield a portion of my time and reserve the balance and then use it?

The CHAIRMAN. The gentleman can.

Mr. GRAHAM of Illinois. Mr. Chairman, I yield 10 minutes to the gentleman from Illinois [Mr. MASON].

Mr. MASON. Mr. Chairman, I am very much obliged to my colleague; but in view of the circumstances I do not think it is necessary, and I will yield back the time to the gentleman.

Mr. GRAHAM of Illinois. Mr. Chairman, ever since the outbreak of the European war, as a part of her system of frightfulness, Germany has sent her agents through the civilized world to spread vicious propaganda, to burn and poison, to destroy and to kill, wherever she could in any way impair either the morale or resources or strength of her adversaries. It is a new method of warfare and worthy of its Prussian inventors. It harmonizes with broken treaties and scraps of paper and poisoned gases, defiled women, ravished and desolated countries, submarines and sinkings without trace. For 40 years, while Germany was perfecting her military machine for "the day," she was sending her spies and secret agents into every country and sequestering them there until she should need them. Before we entered the war Bernstorff and his associates sat in pretended amity with us and secretly sent out their agents and spies, paid with German gold, to burn our factories and destroy our industries and take the lives of our people. It was a comparatively easy process. We were not at war with Germany, and, of course, the secret agents of Germany could and did carry on their work of destruction with impunity.

After our entrance into the war the system of sabotage that had been carried on during our neutrality continued, but to a greater degree. In the hope that I may, perhaps, direct some degree of public attention to the extent of these outrages, and with the hope that further and more drastic action may be taken to curb these secret crimes of sabotage, I desire, in the time allotted to me, to make some general observations on this subject.

At the expenditure of some considerable time and effort I have attempted to estimate the vast extent of sabotage in this

country since the declaration of war. Such a task in itself is a difficult one. There is no department of government that has attempted to list or classify these crimes so that we can form an intelligent idea of their extent. I have applied to the chief of the Bureau of Investigations at the Department of Justice and am told that, owing to the many problems connected with the war which that bureau has had to deal with, the bureau has not kept up the ordinary classification of crimes prosecuted by it, to say nothing of a classification of these crimes of enemy aliens and sympathizers.

Therefore, to get an intelligent idea of the magnitude of the work of the spies and disloyal criminals in the country, we are forced to rely largely on the reports as gathered by the Associated Press and other news bureaus and published in the daily press of the country. These reports, of course, are not entirely accurate. In the general excitement throughout the country, caused by the war, people are apt to see in every burning and every calamity the nefarious hand of the enemy. There are doubtless fires and explosions reported as caused by the enemy that arise from natural causes. But it is equally true that there are many cases unreported by the press bureaus that are caused by incendiaries and enemy sympathizers. For instance, during last fall I had occasion to be at Lewes, Del., during one of the short intermissions of Congress, for some days. This is the heart of the tomato-canning district, and at that particular time, in September, the crop was coming in and was being canned at the many canneries through the country. In one week's time three factories in that locality were burned, with hundreds of thousands of cans of this valuable vegetable product, and in some cases many loaded cars were also consumed. These fires were known to be incendiary. In all of them the fires originated in many places at once, and those first on the scene found evident traces of the use of kerosene. So far as I could observe, there were no reports of these outrages in the metropolitan press; only local mention in local papers was made of them. As will be indicated in my statement of crimes hereinafter, it is very evident that very large numbers of injuries to life and property directly traceable to the activities of enemies or enemy sympathizers are unreported by the press, probably sufficient to more than balance those reported as the work of the enemy that are, in fact, from natural causes.

In the examination of the crimes of sabotage I have only taken such as are reported to be supposed to be of an incendiary or intentionally destructive character. I have also confined myself to reports of fires and explosions in plants engaged in war industries or having to do with war contracts of some kind.

Do not understand me as stating that all these crimes which are committed are the work of enemy aliens. Some of them result from the activities of disloyal citizens of our own country. As to all such, I may remark, our statute on treason applies, and I am convinced that a liberal use of its drastic provisions in such cases would be highly efficacious. I am informed by the Department of Justice that almost all of the pro-German propaganda in the country, while it is doubtless inspired from German sources, is in fact spread and circulated by pacifists and agitators and American pro-German sympathizers; such men as the one who recently stood before the people of one of our States as a candidate for the high office of United States Senator on the shameful platform of an abandonment of the war and peace on any terms dictated by the common enemy of mankind.

In the month of April there were reported five great incendiary fires and four explosions in industrial plants making war munitions. One of these, at least, was known to be the explosion of a bomb. One of them was the terrific catastrophe of April 1 at Chester, Pa., of the Eddystone Ammunition Corporation plant. On the 19th, at Trenton, N. J., some prowler about to be foiled at his work, shot at and attempted to kill, from ambush, a soldier sentry. But fragmentary estimates of losses are given, but the losses reported by the press for the month of April in five of these cases were \$1,500,000 in money, and in all 124 people were killed and 54 wounded. The money loss does not include the loss at the Eddystone plant.

It will be remembered that the press reports of these crimes do not often give an estimate of the money losses; therefore, the estimates I give here are probably not 50 per cent of the actual losses in money, to say nothing of consequential losses.

In May, 6 incendiary fires were reported and 4 explosions in war plants. But four estimates of financial loss out of the 10 were obtainable, and these aggregated \$1,715,000. In this month there were 9 people killed and 25 wounded in these disasters. Two steamships were set on fire at their docks, one the German steamship *Princess Irene* at New York, and the other the British steamer *Matoppe* at Boston. Another steam-

ship pier was blown up at Sault Ste. Marie. This month, also, began a series of poisoning outrages, which has continued ever since; a large number of soldiers were poisoned at Pittsburgh, Pa.

In June three incendiary fires were reported, one of these a steamship that burned at its pier. Six plants were wrecked or injured by explosions. Of three reports of losses, the estimated loss was \$1,450,000; 19 people were killed and 36 wounded in these occurrences. Among them the water system of a city was destroyed by dynamite. The poisoning continued; anthrax germs were used to inoculate cattle, and large numbers died by reason of it. In addition many attempts were made to inflict injuries that failed. An attempt was made to wreck the train in which Gen. Wood was traveling near Birmingham, Ala. A bomb was found in an aeroplane factory, and other similar outrages were prevented.

In July incendiary fires almost without number were reported. Aside from fires in great industrial plants making war munitions, in the early part of the month, from all over the Northwest, many elevator fires were reported. There are no available estimates of the number of these elevator fires. How many bushels of sorely needed grain were then destroyed it would be hard to say, but it is doubtless a large amount. In one elevator fire at Rochester, N. Y., \$1,000,000 worth of grain and property were destroyed. At Klamath Falls, Oreg., 225 horses and cattle were reported poisoned; at Sacramento, Cal., hogs and cattle were poisoned in large numbers; at Mobile, Ala., cattle were poisoned with anthrax germs; at Kansas City, Mo., tetanus germs were used in court-plaster. Two fire losses reported aggregated \$1,350,000; 11 were killed and 62 wounded during the month.

In August these crimes fell off noticeably. In that month there were but few losses from sabotage reported. In two of them reported, however, there were financial losses of \$1,500,000, and four people lost their lives.

During the month of September the ordinary amount of crime of this nature continued. At Fort Sheridan, Ill., many horses were reported killed by the use of arsenic on the hay. The cargo of the Swedish steamer *Magdo* was set on fire at her dock in New York, with a loss of \$1,000,000. Three fire losses reported were \$1,100,000 and four people were injured.

Now, I desire you to observe that these crimes, this violence I am speaking of, is not decreasing but is rapidly increasing. As I have observed, in August but six such occurrences were reported. Observe, now, how they increased in October. Early in the month a series of incendiary fires broke out in the fruit-packing plants and warehouses near San Francisco, Modesto, and San Diego, Cal. How many there were or how much fruit was destroyed it would be hard to say. Elevators were burned with millions of bushels of grain. Still the devilish poisoner plied his trade, and attempts were made at Princeton, N. J., to poison aviation students with cyanide of potassium, and at St. Paul tetanus germs were found in large quantities in vaccine. Eight fire losses estimated a loss of \$9,260,000. Piers and docks were burned and ships were fired at their docks. One grain elevator at New York was lost, with 700,000 bushels of grain and a money loss of \$1,200,000. So frequent were the fires along the water front in New York that Police Chief Kenlon reported during the month that there had been 56 water-front fires "lately."

I have not time to recount all these matters. I wish I could, that I might impress more vividly the necessity of doing something to fight the enemy in our own country. I have tabulated these outrages as I have gathered them from the press, but unless it is desired I shall not burden the House with reading them at large.

In November alone 10 people at widely separated points were poisoned and killed by tetanus germs in vaccine. Many explosions and fires occurred, and many incendiary and explosive bombs and infernal machines were discovered before they had done their work. To illustrate the lack of care we use as a Nation in this war, on November 11 the plant of the Washburn Wire Co. at New York, N. Y., burned, thought to be incendiary, with a loss of \$2,000,000, and with much material needed at once by our military forces. At the time there were working in the plant 25 enemy Germans and 200 enemy Austrians. I say enemies, for it is true, is it not, that a citizen and subject of a nation with whom we are at war owes allegiance and service to his mother country? If he did not, he would be a poor citizen indeed. Only six estimates of losses were given, and these aggregate \$2,902,000; 21 people lost their lives, and 85 were wounded and injured. A steamship at its pier in New York was thought to be set on fire. Thousands of cattle were poisoned during the month, and many elevators burned. It was reported

that at many widely scattered points in Minnesota and the Dakotas elevator fires occurred.

In December the losses continued undiminished. Ten reported losses were \$3,172,500, while 15 people were killed and 50 were wounded. Powdered glass was used in many places. Thousands of surgical dressings were found poisoned and destroyed by medical inspectors. Torpedoes were found ready for use with defective gyroscopes, doubtless so made by intent.

In January and February the losses mounted. There were more fires, more explosions, ships, wharves, steamboats, transfer plants, supplies were burned or destroyed by bombs or explosives. In January, of 14 losses reported, the aggregate was \$7,210,000. One man lost his life and 58 or more were injured. In February, in 9 losses reported, \$1,910,000 was given as the aggregate, and 3 were killed and 26 injured.

During March three losses reported were \$1,910,000, and five were killed and scores injured.

An inspection of these losses demonstrates the general character of them and the objects that were evidently sought to be obtained. They invariably affected some necessary war activity or industry. In the list you will find the objectives usually attacked were ships and shipyards, chemical plants, munition factories, and foodstuffs of all kinds. They were not confined to any particular locality, although most of them were along the Atlantic coast; they occurred in almost every State of the Union, and wherever food or munition supplies could be most easily and vitally affected.

This concludes a year of war. No one knows how much the aggregate financial loss is. As has been stated, estimates are not made in half of the cases. Hence we can not estimate the loss, but the ones I have mentioned aggregate the astonishing total of \$32,078,000, while 212 people were killed and 490 maimed and injured. I believe I am exact in saying that more people have been killed during the first year of war by acts of sabotage than there were by the land operations of the enemy.

Now, making allowance for the cases I have enumerated, which are accidental, it is evident that the ones which were the work of enemy spies and sympathizers were detestable crimes of the utmost violence. Can anyone imagine a more heinous crime than the act of the miscreant who places explosives where they may, hours or days afterwards, wreck and ruin everything near them and destroy innocent human life? If this is not murder, what is murder? "Thou shalt not kill" has been the injunction laid upon mankind from its infancy. It is the one crime that all the races have agreed merits the extreme penalty of death. For the soldier who meets his foeman in the strife and kills there is excuse and even commendation, but for the sneaking, cowardly hound who slinks through the dark to his ghoulish mission of destruction and death there is but one fitting end—the rope or a firing squad before a blank wall.

Has anyone heard of the infliction of any severe punishment on anyone who has been guilty of any of these crimes since the war began? As a matter of fact, it is probably true that but few have been arrested for such crimes. Many arrests have been made and many convictions had throughout the country for alleged disloyal statements, but I dare say but few for positive acts of sabotage. The principal reason for this was the lack of a Federal law on the subject; there were ample State laws, but little enforcement of them. Therefore the criminal does not fear the law and the acts continue in full measure. We ought to stop it for two reasons: To retain our self-respect as a nation, surely we ought to be able to suppress the enemy in our own land; and, second, that our resources may not be destroyed and dissipated, while we are straining every energy to do the mighty task allotted to us. These crimes will not end until we instill the fear of God into hearts of all who would commit such outrages. They will not end until we lead some of the criminals out before the people and before the guns of a firing squad make them expiate their crimes.

A failure to punish these criminals will lead to disorders among our people just as sure as the morrow is coming. There have already been outbreaks reported which are typical of what may occur at any time. When the minds of the people are overexcited because of war activities, when they are giving their boys to the battle, when they are giving up their property to pay taxes and their earnings as loans to the Government they will not patiently submit to the work of traitors and spies at home. The people of this country are fast coming to the time when they will begin to hate and they will take a hand in this matter if Congress and the officers of justice of the Government do not do what they can.

If it is true, as we fear it is, that the American people are just at the beginning of years of war; if it is true, as we are coming reluctantly to believe, that many a long and bloody day

shall pass before the Hun shall be willing to keep within his own domain and keep the peace with the world; if our best and noblest and bravest sons must die before this bloody business is over, we at least ought not to permit the enemy to attack us from behind while our soldiers are facing his guns at the front. Not all of us can carry the guns and do the fighting; some of us must cross the seas and some must stay; but we who stay can keep our country loyal and true and crush out sedition and treason and the machinations of our enemies at home.

And when one thinks of it seriously there is no particular reason why crimes of sabotage should not occur at frequent intervals and extensively throughout the entire country. The Chief of the Division of Investigations of the Department of Justice informs me that there are approximately 415,000 enemy Germans in the United States and 1,500,000 enemy Austrians. How many Turks and Bulgars there are nobody knows. The Department of Justice does not know; the Bureau of the Census does not know. Where they are no one knows. It may be said that as to these Turks and Bulgars, their number is inconsequential, and we are not at war with them, anyhow. Be that as it may, their people are fighting our friends, and if they win, we lose; if they are victorious, we suffer the fate of the vanquished, do we not? Whatever the facts may be about a declaration of war, these people owe allegiance to their mother countries and will help them if they can. It has been said a great number of Austrians in this country, of Slavic descent, are hostile to the central powers; this is true. I know of Austrian citizens in my district who are giving their boys to the military service and in their hearts despise the government of their mother country.

It has been said that without the labor of the Austro-Hungarian citizens many of our mines and industrial plants would have to close. It is not desirable to take these workers from their places unless it is necessary, but a system of careful registration of and reports by such enemy aliens is highly desirable; the enemy alien who is a friend of this country will be glad to report when required to and thus help the country. If he is not willing to do so, he is not a friend of our cause and ought to be interned or deported.

A careful registration of all alien enemies should be made, including Turks and Bulgars. Whenever an alien enemy goes from one place of residence to another or from one occupation to another, the Government should know where he goes; and he should go only on permission of the proper officers connected with the Department of Justice or some other proper department of the Government. In other words, the Government should know all the time just exactly what every enemy alien is doing and where he is. This is the method pursued in other countries, as I understand it. Imagine, if you please, an alien enemy to Germany roaming around Berlin without surveillance by the authorities. Imagine a German citizen in London doing as he pleases. In Germany in peace time there is absolute knowledge by the authorities of the comings and goings of every stranger. The same is true in other European countries. I would not favor this system in times of peace. I do say, however, the exigencies of the war require a careful surveillance of enemy aliens in a time such as this.

War was declared April 6, 1917, against Germany. The same day the President issued a proclamation enjoining upon male German aliens above the age of 14 years certain obligations. They must not bear arms, nor operate aircraft or wireless apparatus; they should not approach a fort or Government post nearer than one-half mile, nor print attacks against the Government, nor commit hostile acts, nor live in areas prohibited by the proclamation of the President, nor land in or depart from the United States without permission. There was no provision for registration, and there was none for six months following the declaration of war.

However, there was a statute that authorized the President to intern or deport or register these alien enemies at any time after the declaration of war. This act has been the law for 120 years, and was enacted July 6, 1798, being section 4067 of the Revised Statutes.

On the 16th day of November, 1917, the President issued a second proclamation. This proclamation required all alien enemies—German—to register at times and places to be fixed by the Attorney General by regulations to be issued by him. The President directed this registration should be "as speedily as may be practicable," and that registration cards should be issued to all alien enemies, and that the Attorney General might make such rules and regulations as he thought fit. It also provided that no alien enemy could change his place of abode without permission.

I also direct special attention to the fact that the President, by this proclamation, authorized the Attorney General to make

such regulations for "monthly, weekly, or other periodical reports" by the aliens as he might think necessary.

That proclamation was issued, as I have said, on November 16, 1917. The Attorney General issued his regulations about six weeks later, on December 31, 1917. The registration began on February 4, 1918, and has just been concluded and the blanks are just now being returned to the Attorney General's office. There are approximately four or five hundred thousand of them. When I last inquired about this matter they had not been filed nor classified nor indexed, but were simply a conglomerate mass of information, tons of it, but with no immediate value, because it was not in shape to be available. In response to my inquiries at the office at that time I was told that it was not known how soon this work could be done.

The President recommended that the alien enemies should be required to report. The Attorney General has not required it. His published regulations required no reports at all, and in that respect he has disregarded a safety provision of the President. Of what value, pray, is the registration of a man if from the day he registers the Government has no method of ascertaining his whereabouts. If an alien enemy living in Baltimore goes to New York and remains there for a year, how is the Government to know of it under the present regulations? But if this alien enemy, once a week, or periodically, must call on the proper authorities and identify himself and report, when he fails to report the Government at once is advised and will attempt to locate him and ascertain his business.

The Department of Justice informs me that they are now considering the advisability of inaugurating a system of reports by enemy aliens of German descent. However, the point is, that after a year of war no such reports are required, and it is uncertain when they shall be.

On December 7, 1917, we declared war on the Austro-Hungarian Government. On December 11, 1917, the President issued his proclamation enjoining upon Austro-Hungarian citizens, resident here, three duties—not to depart from or enter the United States without permission, and making any such alien enemy liable to summary arrest and confinement who violates any laws, rules, or regulations, or who seems to be dangerous. There was no registration of Austro-Hungarians at all provided for.

Therefore, we find after a year of war, in which we have spent many billions, in which our sons have died on the sea and on the land, in which we have lost millions in money and stores of food and munitions, whose value to us now is almost incalculable, by torch and bomb, we have no knowledge, as a people, of whom the enemies are that are among us. We do not know their numbers or where they are. We do not know their comings or their goings. There may be a million of them, or there may be 3,000,000. They may be employed, and doubtless are, in every munition plant and mine and arsenal in the land. And, what is more essential, we do not seem to have any plans for bettering these conditions in the immediate future. We seem to propose to muddle along somehow and do things only when we are obliged to by impending disaster. The policy seems to be to disturb no alien enemy until he burns a factory or a ship, and then to intern him in comfortable quarters, with good, wholesome food, instead of shooting him dead at sunrise, as he deserves.

I said in the House on February 12 last that I did not believe criticism in times of war was defensible unless it was constructive. What remarks I have made have not been intended to be in criticism of the administration at all, but are simply made with the hope that they may attract attention to a condition that we all want to see bettered. I have stood by the country in every measure that has been proposed to this Congress. I have supported the President in everything he has asked for. I propose to continue supporting the Government and the President in every measure that may be suggested for the good of the country and which will help us whip the accursed Hun and secure the blessings of peace and honor to us and our posterity.

I believe that every German and Austro-Hungarian alien enemy ought to be at once registered and required to report at frequent intervals at certain designated and convenient registration points. The Department of Justice should be directed, by proper legislation, to maintain surveillance over these alien enemies, and proper appropriations should be made for this purpose by this Congress. It is absolutely futile to expect the Department of Justice to do this work without ample financial provision for so doing. There should, above all things, be a most stringent law as to sabotage, imposing a maximum penalty of death for such offenses. The law just passed, with a maximum penalty of 30 years' imprisonment, in my judgment, is insufficient. Why should we be so tender with those alien enemies who imperil and take the lives of our people by their

crimes? Why leave them to be prosecuted in the courts of the States, whose proceedings are notoriously slow and full of delays? There should be ample Federal laws, and the remedies should be certain and the machinery summary.

One other suggestion I have in mind. We have many agencies in our Government for the detection of crime, but no central authority. The Army has its Army Intelligence; the Navy its Naval Intelligence; the Department of Justice has its Division of Investigations; the Post Office Department has its system of inspection and investigation; the Treasury Department has its Secret Service engaged in investigations of revenue and other crimes. The work of these various branches of the Government is secret and extends over the whole country. In many instances the work is liable to be duplicated, while the work of all these various agencies can not be centralized upon any particular object with ease and celerity under the present system. It would seem that it would be better that the secret service of the Government be consolidated under one supreme head and the activities of all be directed by one central authority. It seems to me that more efficiency would result, less expense would be entailed, and more crime would be punished. In this particular instance that I have been discussing—the control of alien enemies—great advantage would doubtless result. I am told that frequent and regular conferences are held between the heads of the various secret-service departments of our Government, and in this way the various branches work harmoniously. We shall find, sooner or later, that these agencies can not function separately if they are to be of the highest efficiency. The allies have found that to be at all successful there must be one supreme command. The Germans always knew it. It is equally as true in our Government and it is true in the secret service. There ought to be one chief directing mind.

Let it be understood that I am not criticizing others and losing sight of the derelictions of Congress. On April 4, 1917, there was introduced in the Senate a bill to punish acts of sabotage. It was not at all a drastic bill. It did not provide the death penalty, as it should have done. That bill, I am told, was prepared by the Department of Justice, and was sorely needed. However, it did not finally pass both Houses of Congress until a few days ago. The slight amendments sought for the espionage law have just finally been agreed to in conference. There have been no attempts at all on the part of Congress, as I am advised, to give such additional powers to the Postmaster General's office as will enable the Government to curb and stop the flow of seditious and anti-American propaganda that every day pours through the mails; most of it at second-class postal rates. More harm is done to the morale of the country by this insidious publication and distribution of such matter than by the torch and bomb of the plotters and spies. It may be said it would curb the freedom of written and printed speech. If one can not, in these crucial days, when the Huns are battering at the gates of civilization, speak well of his country, he ought to close his mouth, and if he will not do so, then the arm of the Government, the sovereign right of the people, should compel him to do so. We have no rights in time of war except such rights as are subject to the higher rights of the Nation. "The safety of the people is the supreme law." [Applause.]

Mr. GALLIVAN. Mr. Chairman, I yield 10 minutes to the gentleman from Mississippi [Mr. HARRISON].

Mr. DAVIS. Mr. Chairman, can the Chair inform me how much time the gentleman from Illinois just used?

The CHAIRMAN. The gentleman yielded back two minutes. Mr. DAVIS. Does the Chair know how many minutes he used?

The CHAIRMAN. He used 33 minutes.

Mr. HARRISON of Mississippi. Mr. Chairman, on yesterday I introduced in the House a bill that ought to appeal to its entire membership. It provides for the employment by the Government of disabled soldiers and sailors and gives them a preferential status under present civil-service laws.

The bill does not seek to load the public service of the United States with incompetents. None of the established safeguards of the civil service are in the least weakened and none abrogated. It simply proposes that the Government shall show its gratitude to the men who have offered their bodies as a living rampart against the overrunning of this world by the German barbarians, and have suffered wounds and injuries thereby which place these men at a disadvantage in the keen competition of ordinary life.

The Government has work to be done. It needs thousands of workers in clerical positions. This bill undertakes to substantially recognize the debt we are under to these men, and requires that, all other things being equal, and there being no doubt of the competency and ability of the wounded man to dis-

charge the duties of the position, he shall be given the preference in the selection.

Other countries in this war are utilizing their wounded and disabled men—England, France, Germany, Austria-Hungary, Belgium, Canada, New Zealand—according to their capabilities. It appears to be an act of justice very generally recognized.

Mr. FESS. Mr. Chairman—

The CHAIRMAN. Does the gentleman yield?

Mr. FESS. The gentleman is discussing one of the most important items of legislation that will be offered in this Congress. There is a joint committee now carrying on hearings, and here are only a few Members in the House, and I am going to make the point of no quorum.

Mr. HARRISON of Mississippi. I hope the gentleman will not make it, because I am about through.

Mr. FESS. It is the only time I have ever done so since I have been here, but there are so few Members here now—

Mr. HARRISON of Mississippi. I sincerely hope the gentleman will not do so.

Mr. FESS. Mr. Chairman, I make the point of no quorum.

The CHAIRMAN. The gentleman from Ohio makes the point of order that there is no quorum present. The Chair will count. [After counting.] Evidently a quorum is not present, and the Clerk will call the roll.

The roll was called, and the following Members failed to answer to their names:

Alexander	Eagle	Kelley, Mich.	Roberts
Anthony	Edmonds	Kennedy, Iowa	Rosenberg
Austin	Estopinal	Kennedy, R. I.	Rose
Baer	Fairchild, B. L.	Kettner	Rouse
Barnhart	Fairchild, G. W.	Key, Ohio	Rowland
Blackmon	Farr	King	Sanders, La.
Booher	Ferris	Kreider	Sanford
Britten	Fields	LaGuardia	Saunders, Va.
Brodbeck	Fisher	Lee, Ga.	Scott, Pa.
Browning	Flynn	Lehlbach	Scully
Butler	Focht	Lever	Shouse
Campbell, Pa.	Fordney	Littlepage	Slayden
Cannon	Foss	McAndrews	Slomp
Caraway	Frear	McArthur	Sloan
Carew	Freeman	McCulloch	Small
Carter, Mass.	Fuller, Mass.	McLennore	Smith, Mich.
Clark, Fla.	Gallagher	Madden	Smith, T. F.
Clark, Pa.	Garland	Maher	Stafford
Coady	Glass	Mann	Steele
Connelly, Kans.	Godwin, N. C.	Mondell	Sterling, Pa.
Cooper, Ohio	Gordon	Montague	Sullivan
Cooper, W. Va.	Graham, Pa.	Morin	Summers
Copley	Gray, Ala.	Mott	Swift
Costello	Gregg	Mudd	Templeton
Crago	Griest	Nichols, Mich.	Thompson
Cramton	Hamilton, N. Y.	Norton	Tinkham
Crosser	Haskell	Oldfield	Vare
Curry, Cal.	Hawley	Olney	Venable
Dale, Vt.	Hayes	O'Shaunessy	Vestal
Davidson	Helntz	Padgett	Vinson
Denison	Helm	Peters	Volgt
Dent	Hensley	Phelan	Waldow
Dewalt	Hicks	Porter	Walker
Dies	Hood	Powers	Ward
Dill	Howard	Pratt	Webb
Doelling	Hull, Iowa	Rainey, J. W.	White, Me.
Doughton	Humphreys	Ramsey	Wilson, Tex.
Drukker	Hutchinson	Randall	Woodyard
Dunn	Jacoway	Reavis	
Dupré	Johnson, S. Dak.	Riordan	
Eagan	Jones	Robbins	

Thereupon the committee rose; and the Speaker having resumed the Chair, Mr. GARNER, Chairman of the Committee of the Whole House on the state of the Union, reported that that committee, having under consideration the bill H. R. 11692, the District of Columbia appropriation bill, finding itself without a quorum, he had caused the roll to be called, whereupon 269 Members answered to their names, and that he presented therewith the names of the absentees for printing in the RECORD.

The SPEAKER. A quorum is present. The committee will resume its sitting.

The committee resumed its session.

The CHAIRMAN. The gentleman from Mississippi [Mr. HARRISON] has six minutes remaining.

Mr. SEARS. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman from Mississippi yield?

Mr. HARRISON of Mississippi. I yield.

Mr. SEARS. I notice with a great deal of pleasure the interest which the able Representative from Mississippi is taking in this matter, and I would like to ask him if he has considered the feasibility or the advisability of incorporating his suggestion in the bill introduced by Senator HOKE SMITH and myself for the rehabilitation of soldiers?

Mr. HARRISON of Mississippi. I will say to the gentleman that I would be very glad if the idea embodied in my bill could be embodied in the bill known as the Smith-Sears bill. I can not see why it could not all be put together.

Mr. SEARS. I would like the gentleman to better those, as he has been attending some of these hearings and I know is interested in the matter.

Mr. HARRISON of Mississippi. This Congress will shortly be called upon to consider and enact a comprehensive system of vocational reeducation and rehabilitation of men who have been injured in the armed forces of the United States. Those men, however maimed their poor bodies may be, are among our most precious assets, for, enshrined in their hearts, the sacred flame of liberty illuminates the shrine of justice, democracy, and love of country. They have suffered and bled for these things. In the long years of slothful peace to come, the example and the spirit of these men will go far toward keeping us in the straight road leading to our ideals. So, where a man returns broken in body, we are going to salvage him; give him the very best care that medical science and experience can give; repair him as far as is possible, and educate him to do something for a living—something he can do well, despite his handicap.

Necessarily clerical work will occupy a large place in a system designed for men physically unfitted for work requiring considerable strength or activity or endurance. It is more than likely there will be special courses of training designed to fit those capable of taking civil-service examinations and able to perform the various sorts of clerical work this Government is constantly in the market for.

Is it too much to ask the healthy, husky, able person who has never passed into the valley of the shadow of death, and through the veritable inferno of the battle front, to stand aside and give precedence to the maimed remnant of manhood who has endured those things, who has fought the good fight, and now drags his broken body back to the shores of the country he has helped save?

The chief trouble of these disabled men is the fear that they have become useless—that they are mere wrecks cast by the red tide of war on the shores of time, there to slowly disintegrate. The knowledge that they can do useful work despite their handicaps, the conviction that they are yet of use in the world, heartens them and gives them a new lease on life.

It is proper, therefore, that the Government which is reeducating them and fitting them to take their places again as useful members of society should set the example in giving them employment.

Our Labor Department and the placement division of the reeducation work will soon be issuing patriotic appeals for opportunities for employment for the returned men who have been wounded and refitted for usefulness in this, and that line of endeavor.

We had better set the example ourselves to the private employers of labor, and we can with clean hands and clear conscience then make our appeal for justice for the wounded men; not charity but justice, in affording them an opportunity to make a living once more. [Applause.]

I yield back any time I have remaining.

The CHAIRMAN. The gentleman yields back four minutes.

Mr. DAVIS. Mr. Chairman, I yield 10 minutes to the gentleman from Pennsylvania [Mr. Moore].

Mr. MOORE of Pennsylvania. Mr. Chairman, it pains me to do what I am about to do now, but those of us who are afflicted with the divine afflatus and who burn the midnight oil, must find an outlet even if we impose on our colleagues in this House. The lines which I am now about to recite, written in the vernacular of the street, have no personal application. If they have any title at all, they might be called "Doggerel on a Dog Fight." [Laughter.]

With this brief prefatory statement, I will proceed. [Applause.]

I.

If you was a slacker of high degree,
And welched on a liberty bond, tax free,
An' ye couldn't get over to "Gay Paree"
For a swell old time like ye used to, see!

What'd ye do, bo,
What'd ye do?
Would ye sit in yer corner and write a note
A-beggin' the words of the late Rufus Choate,
And tell yer "damned" Congressman how he should vote?
You betcha!

II.

If you was a worker that wouldn't work
And ye hated the feller that didn't shirk,
And ye heard a lip-patriot talk like a Turk,
What'd ye do, bo,
What'd ye do?
Would ye call in yer reekin' calamity crew
And give 'em a rope and a drink'er two,
And say, "Uncle Sammy, I done it fer you"?
You betcha!

III.

If you was chased by a million spies
That danced in yer ears and bulged yer eyes,
And made ye see glass in yer cranberry pies,
What'd ye do, bo,
What'd ye do?
Would ye even it up with the folks next door,
And tell the fy cops to go in an' explore
An honest man's home, for munitions of war?
You betcha!

IV.

If you was in wrong with all of the boys,
And they didn't fall fer yer kind a' noise,
And ye just sort'a lost yer equipoise,
What'd ye do, bo,
What'd ye do?
Would ye call 'em traitors and take yer stand
At the White House gate with yer flag in hand,
And pose as a patriot noble and grand?
You betcha!

V.

Or if they needed ye in the ranks
And ye sent yer relations, all, with thanks,
And the juice ran down in yer hot-air tanks,
What'd ye do, bo,
What'd ye do?

[Laughter.]

Would ye shout yer buncombe over the sea,
And grabbing the Starry Banner, free,
Still pull down yer pay from the Treasury?
You betcha!

[Laughter.]

VI.

Maybe ye would, but disposed to do right
And help, with the rest of us, win this great fight,
Forgettin' the lure of the calcium light,
Here's what ye'd do, bo,
Here's what ye'd do:
Y' would stand by the job 'til the big work was done,
Giving cheer and support to the man with the gun,
Keepin' all the ranks closed 'til the triumph was won,
That's what ye'd do, bo,
That's what ye'd do.

[Applause.]

MORAL.

Here's the moral, good friends, this recital would teach:
Let us rather make good than rely upon speech,
Instead of self-praise and the splitting of hair
Keep busy and back up the boys "over there."

The cheapest of patriots under the sun
Is the fakir who brags about what he has done;
But meaner than he is the sanctified sort,
Who plays up suspicion to stand well at court.

True patriots, then, will first yield to the Nation,
No matter how high or how low is their station;
And standing together, grown stronger and wiser,
Make victory sure o'er His Menace the Kaiser.

[Loud applause.]

I yield back the balance of my time.

The CHAIRMAN. The gentleman yields back six minutes.

Mr. MEEKER. A parliamentary inquiry, Mr. Chairman.

The CHAIRMAN. The gentleman will state it.

Mr. MEEKER. Is this field day in the District?

The CHAIRMAN. The Chair does not think that is a parliamentary inquiry, he will state to the gentleman.

Mr. DAVIS. Mr. Chairman, I yield five minutes to the gentleman from Wisconsin [Mr. Cary].

Mr. CARY. Mr. Chairman, I do not think I will use the five minutes, but I would like to have this letter read for the benefit of the House.

The CHAIRMAN. Without objection, the Clerk will read.

The Clerk read as follows:

S26 SOUTH DAKOTA STREET,
Butte, Mont., April 26, 1918.

HON. WILLIAM J. CARY, M. C.,
Washington, D. C.

DEAR SIR: We, the members of the Good Government Club of Silver Bow County and the Boosters' Clubs of the city of Butte, State of Montana, respectfully call your attention, and through your attention of the entire delegation of your State in the United States Congress, to the resolution unanimously adopted by the above-mentioned bodies relative to the treatment accorded our first Congresswoman from the State of Montana by the self-appointed and self-constituted committee of superpatriots, who in defiance of the provisions of various war measures duly passed by our Sixty-fifth Congress and approved by the President of the United States, assumed the power to interfere with the Government in its prosecution of the war through their attempted prevention of the presentation of the cause of our Government in this the third liberty loan by the aforementioned Congresswoman, Miss JEANETTE RANKIN.

In spite of the treatment accorded Miss RANKIN, she earnestly urged that the petty tyranny of local autocrats might not interfere with the enthusiasm for this war for world democracy. She pleaded against any feelings of bitterness toward the Government because the taxpayers of Silver Bow County had been denied the right to use their own school building for a patriotic meeting. Her eloquent appeal for the third liberty loan was enthusiastically cheered and liberally responded to by the purchase of liberty bonds by the shivering crowd.

The resolutions as unanimously adopted read as follows:

"We, citizens residents, and voters of the county of Silver Bow, State of Montana, through the Good Government Club and the Boosters' Clubs, hereby adopt the following resolutions:

"We most heartily condemn and disapprove of the action of the committee having in charge the meeting held in the Broadway Theater on Wednesday evening, April 17, 1918. Despite the fact that Miss JEANETTE RANKIN, who is the duly elected Representative of the State of Montana to the National Congress, was here on the said night speaking in behalf of the third liberty loan, the committee in charge, and particularly the chairman, refused to allow Miss RANKIN to address the meeting. Not only that, but the committee, through its chairman, absolutely prevented Miss RANKIN from making a speech on the third liberty loan in the auditorium of the Butte High School after arrangements had been made for same.

"We wish to call the attention of all citizens to the fact that the Butte High School was built and is being maintained by the citizens and taxpayers of Silver Bow County, Mont., and that the auditorium of the high school is used and should be used on all occasions as a public forum. The committee, through its chairman, compelled Miss RANKIN to speak on a 1-inch rail of the high school fence in the slush and cold of a raw April night.

"We believe that while we are fighting the autocracy of Europe we should not be ground under the heel of the local autocracy of Silver Bow County, Mont. As we are dedicating our lives and property to the cause of democracy in Europe, we should dedicate a little of our efforts to see that democracy is kept alive at home.

"The noble work which the women of America are doing in this war in the selling of liberty bonds, thrift stamps, in Young Men's Christian Association work, Red Cross work, and the giving of their sons to fight the battles of democracy is enough to guarantee the women of this country the right of franchise and of free speech, without the prevention by alleged patriots who are attempting to regulate the business of the war to their selfish purpose.

"The boasted chivalry of American manhood, which we have been taught from our mothers' lips, was sadly lacking at Wednesday evening's action of the local committee in charge of the third liberty loan, and we feel that Butte has suffered a disgrace thereby unparalleled in all her history."

BOOSTER CLUBS OF BUTTE, MONT.
GOOD GOVERNMENT CLUB OF SILVER BOW COUNTY,
By Mrs. H. N. KENNEDY, President.

Mr. WALSH. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. CARY. Yes, sir.

Mr. WALSH. What does the gentleman, who has had the communication read to the House, propose to do about it?

Mr. CARY. I asked that it be read for the information of the Members of the House. As a Member of the House I thought the lady was entitled to that.

Mr. WALSH. Does the gentleman propose any action on the part of the House?

Mr. CARY. Not at all. It was just for the information of the House.

Mr. Sisson. Mr. Chairman, I yield 20 minutes to the gentleman from Missouri [Mr. BORLAND].

Mr. BORLAND. Mr. Chairman, events have shown that in August, 1914, the only great nation in the world prepared for war was the Empire of Germany. Universal military service, extending through more than two full generations, had made its man power immediately available. It was the greatest manufacturer of munitions and scientific weapons that the world has even seen, and the Krupp cannon and the Mauser rifle had made it the profit taker of every war. It lived in an atmosphere of militarism. Its roads, its bridges, its canals, its railway lines, its rivers and harbors, its laboratories, its manufactories, its industrial system, its natural resources, even its foreign-trade relations, were all constructed, adjusted, and developed in anticipation of "the day" when it should feel strong enough to make war upon civilization.

No nation was threatening the safety or integrity of the German Empire. No nation was in a position to threaten it. Thus the page of history is clearly written.

By the same logic of events we now know that of all the great nations in the world the least prepared for war on that day was the United States of America. We had no adequate Army. Our Army numbered barely 85,000 men for a Nation of a hundred million people—too small to police our shortest international border on the Rio Grande. And yet that Army had grown in expense as it had decreased in relative value until it was costing this country every year 50 per cent as much as the 5,000,000 armed defenders of Germany.

We had no adequate Navy. We had endowed our Navy with appropriations more liberally than any nation except England, the mistress of the seas, and yet we were told that we were in fourth or fifth place and that we could not successfully defend either the Atlantic or Pacific coast.

We had no merchant marine. The American flag had all but disappeared from the trade routes of the world. All of the surplus products of our country, all of the output of the energy and enterprise of our people must find its way abroad to market in foreign ships. We were excluded from the neutral markets of the world except as we could serve as hewers of wood and drawers of water for our commercial masters in Europe.

We were a debtor Nation. Millions of our securities were held abroad. Every year it was necessary for us to send tribute

across the water to redeem the interest on our debt; and if we could not pay in cash, as ordinarily we could not, we had to pay in raw materials—wheat, cotton, lumber, oil—draining our natural resources to feed the capital and labor of Europe. We were not adjusted to the full poise and power of an independent nation.

It is useless to inquire at this time who, if anyone, was to blame for this condition of national flabbiness. To my way of thinking, not the wildest flight of the imagination could charge it to the fault of the present administration. We may as well assume that the whole American people were to blame. The truth is that we had not been thinking along those lines. We had been engaged in developing a vast, undeveloped continent, and had not given our attention to the subject of national defense.

Germany is a nation of 65,000,000 people, inhabiting a restricted territory of somewhat limited natural resources. The United States is a Nation of 100,000,000 people, inhabiting a boundless empire of almost untouched natural resources. Our people are just as intelligent, just as resolute, and just as skillful as the inhabitants of Germany, and it is manifest that with an equal degree of thought and preparation this country, single handed, is more than a match for the German Empire in any national contest. [Applause.]

So the fact was that on that day we were less able to defend ourselves against an unprovoked attack than any nation that has ever claimed an independent national existence. When I say an "independent national existence" I mean one not guaranteed by treaties of neutrality, for we all know now what such treaties are worth.

When the blow fell, in the providence of God it did not fall first upon us. If it had, untold suffering and disaster would have resulted before we could have restored the balance. We would have restored the balance. We would have driven every invader from American soil and preserved inviolate every American right, but it would have been at fearful cost of blood and treasure.

It is true we had begun to realize somewhat our need for national unity and strength. We had created the Shipping Board for the purpose of attempting to restore in an experimental way the merchant marine. We had created the Federal Reserve System to abolish panics and to place 12 great reservoirs of credit at the service of American commerce. And we had created the Tariff Commission, designed to take the tariff out of politics and to study in a scientific way the great interchange of commodities between nations and its effect upon industrial progress.

But no steps had been taken toward adequate national defense, except the passage of the national-defense act in June, 1916, which had not had time to go into effective operation prior to our entrance into the war.

When on the 6th day of April, 1917, we entered this war against the most scientific enemy the world has ever seen we were armed only with that magnificent and irrepressible optimism or egotism, whichever we may choose to call it, which is such a distinguishing trait of the American character. It is the feeling that Uncle Sam "can lick the hull of creation," with one hand tied behind his back. It is a valuable trait; we would not be without it for the world. It is responsible for much of our enterprise and our success; but it is not the only weapon that soldiers need in such a war as we had challenged.

We had to create an army after war was declared. Nay, we had to create a military system adapted to the needs of a free people, for we could not even build upon the foundation stone of the Army that we had. It was not a question of increasing the size of the standing Army, for no standing Army would have been adequate to the emergency.

I remember nearly a year before war was declared we had a spirited debate in the House of Representatives, which grew quite bitter at times, over the question whether the standing Army of the United States, a Nation of a hundred million people, should consist of 175,000 or 225,000 men. It hardly seems possible that men could get excited over so small a difference of opinion, yet those of us who voted for the higher number were denounced as "dangerous militarists." Now, we know that neither 175,000 nor 225,000 men are sufficient to storm the enemy's trenches before breakfast in the morning in such a war as we are now waging.

Finally, the solution of the problem came to us and came to the thought of the Nation, and that was that every qualified man of military age was part of the fighting force of his country. If a country is worth having, it is worth defending, and if it is worth defending it is as much one man's duty to defend it as it is another man's duty.

We must have a military system based upon the whole man asset of the Nation, as our banking system is based upon the

whole commercial asset of the Nation, and capable of contracting and expanding as the demand upon it diminishes or increases. This is the only military system worthy of a free and intelligent people. They told us that we could not raise an army by selective conscription in the United States; that the people would not submit to such a system; that it would take an army to raise an army, and therefore Uncle Sam could never have an army; that if we attempted to enforce conscription there would not be jails enough in the country to hold the draft resisters, and we would have to build stockades and bull pens to keep the prisoners in.

Ah, the men who so argued and who so thought had failed utterly to sound the profound depth of patriotism of the American heart! We did try conscription; the 5th day of June, 1917, is a red-letter day in the annals of the American Republic—a day that will be taught to school children from now on to the end of time. On that day, on a single day, between the rising of the sun and the going down of the same, in a Nation of a hundred million people scattered over 3,000 miles of territory, in 48 sovereign States, nearly 10,000,000 red-blooded young Americans stepped forward from the ranks of the people and enrolled themselves to defend the same flag! Where were those draft resisters? Why, there were not enough of them among a hundred million people to get up a real good, first-class street-corner brawl. The great mass of the American people was loyal to the core.

Where is the country, large or small, that ever put the patriotism of its people to such a test? All the annals of history reveal no parallel. On that day the life of the Republic was thrown into the hands of its citizens. The right of democracy to survive among men was put to its supreme test. We said to the Nation: "This day, from the time the sun rises in the east until it sets in the west, there is no sovereign over the heads of the American people. You are in the presence of our armed foe. Your flag has gone into battle. Come forward and defend it. If you do not defend it, it will go down. If any considerable number of you resist, your Government has not the bayonets to force you into subjection. The fate of free government is in your hands."

Thank God for the spontaneous and loyal response of the American people. It was worth being alive to see. Every nation, the oldest, the richest, the proudest, has its dark corners, its disaffected sections, where the mandate of the law must sometimes stay its hand—every nation but our own. The even hand of equal democratic justice can reach into every nook and corner of Uncle Sam's vast domain under the light of a single sun. [Applause.]

On this principle of democratic equality our army was formed. And such an army! Drawn from every home and every fireside in this land; from every trade and occupation; from every race, from every kindred, and from every tribe that make up our people. I have seen that army in a score of camps throughout the United States; and I say to you that for courage, for discipline, for intelligence, for moral character, no finer body of men was ever gathered under any flag in the history of the world than will fight the battles of democracy under Old Glory for Uncle Sam. [Applause.] I place that army on your hearts and commend it to your prayers. [Applause.]

We were fortunate in this crisis in our Nation's history in having in the White House as the executive head of our Government a man big enough to grasp big problems in a big way, and who has shown himself in every emergency a big leader of a big people—Woodrow Wilson, President of the United States. [Applause.]

That army needed arms and equipment. All the resources of the Nation are pledged to its support. Our boys can not fight barehanded. Without ample weapons the most reckless courage that ever fired the heart of man would never reach the front line of the enemy's trenches in such a war as this. It needed rifles and ammunition, artillery and shells, blankets and tentage, hospital supplies and medicine, food and uniforms, motor trucks and transportation and aeroplanes and submarines, and ships, and transports, and convoys, and submarine chasers.

During the summer of 1917 the problems of preparation rolled in upon Congress like a veritable tidal wave. We had not only to create an Army, we had to officer it, and train it, and house it, and feed it, and clothe it, and arm it, and equip it, and transport it. And coincident therewith we had to find the money for financing these unprecedented expenses.

All this takes money. I would not vote, I repeat, I would not vote to conscript American boys and send them to the firing line in France to risk their lives and limbs in defense of their flag—perhaps to pay the last supreme sacrifice that a man can pay—and then refuse to send after them every dollar of American

money necessary to make them victorious and successful in the struggle in which they are engaged.

In the last few months full many a noble-hearted American mother, with a brave smile on her lips, has stood at the door of her little home and waved a smiling "good-by" to her boy until he disappeared in the turn of the road, and then she has gone back into his silent bedchamber and buried her face in his empty pillow and sobbed out the anguish of her soul before the throne of Almighty God. Thousands of us have seen the smiling good-by from the doorway, but perhaps only the Great Father of us all has viewed the scene in the little bedchamber. I feel and believe that there was no bitterness in that mother's tears. There was even a high pride and joy that her boy could go and did go and wanted to go to do a man's part when his country called him. She would not have called him back: if she could, nor would she have had him falter and turn back for anything on earth. There was just one thought, one wish in that mother's heart—that the arms of a mother's love might be around him as he went into camp; that he might be cared for and protected to the limit of human fidelity.

She can not provide for her boy in camp, but you and I can do it, and we must do it. It would be a crime upon our souls if that Army of ours met disaster by the negligence, the selfishness, or the cowardice of those in power. All the sacrifice of this war must not fall on the boys who go to the trenches. There is a large measure of sacrifice for those of us who remain at home. They are fighting our battles. They are defending our flag. They are saving our institutions, and no sacrifice on our part is too great to measure theirs.

We are going to conscript not only your boys, we are going to conscript your money; we are going to conscript your love and your sympathy and your prayers.

I should like to enter in detail into the problems of preparedness. We hear so much of the few things that have not been done that we lose sight of the mighty miracles that have been wrought. Suffice it to say that every American soldier that lands on the soil of France and goes to the front under the command of that gallant Missourian, Gen. John J. Pershing, will be better armed and equipped from top to toe than any soldier that ever set foot in tented field since the dawn of history. We had no illusions on the subject of the magnitude of the task when we entered this war. We knew that three years was the minimum in which to bring the contest to a successful conclusion. We knew it would take one full year to create and place an Army in the field, and we knew it would take at least that long to arouse public spirit and provide what may be called the mental equipment of the Nation. We knew it would take a full year to turn Uncle Sam—good-natured, easy-going, indulgent old Uncle Sam—into a first-class fighting man; and it has taken a year. We knew it would take the full season of 1918 to fight, if possible, a few successful battles, and we knew it would take the full year of 1919 to bring about a satisfactory peace. At that time the collapse of Russia had not taken place. In that regard the situation is less favorable, and Germany may be stronger to-day than when we declared war. We do not count upon the backdown of Germany, and we may as well let her know that we listen to no such insidious whisperings.

We count upon the righteous wrath of an aroused and powerful people to meet her and match her and overmatch her in the field. It will be time enough to talk peace when the armies of the Hun are sent hurling back through France and through Belgium to within the confines of Germany.

Thousands of our boys are to-day on the firing line in France. Thousands are on the gray Atlantic. Thousands more are in the training camps ready to go. For many of them the time has already arrived when we may not draw aside the veil of silence and tell the people even where those boys are or how they fare. With that time at hand, with those boys facing the bullets of the foe in front, they have a right to feel that you and I will see to it that they are in no danger of an attack from the rear; that you and I will not permit any set of people back here to pour the poison of sedition into the veins of good old Uncle Sam.

During all of this time when the life of the Nation was in peril, when the storm of war was gathering over the head of our devoted country, when our safety was menaced by foes within and without, when true patriots were drawing closer together that we might know who stood for "America first," there were not lacking those who sought to confuse public opinion, to tear down American ideals, to becloud the luster of American honor, to destroy the unity and strength of the American Nation, and to spread doubt, discord, and class hatred among our people. They sought to array the farmer against the city man, the laborer against his employer, and the foreign born against the native born—anything to foster discontent and to weaken the arm of Uncle Sam.

A widespread, insistent, and insidious propaganda was carried on to this end. We may know by evidence in the possession of our Government where this propaganda originated and how it was carried on. Some of the propositions were very plausible and deceived many good men. While the danger was at its height I got hundreds of letters and telegrams from my own district on these various propositions. Some of them were from people in whom I had the utmost confidence. I did not assume that my sense of patriotism was a bit higher than theirs, but I did know that I stood a little higher up the mountain side and had a little wider sweep of the horizon, and could see a little clearer where these propositions came from. They all came from the same sinister source and all tended to the same disgraceful end.

The first proposal was that Congress should declare an embargo. They wanted us to close American ports, to destroy our commerce, to let our goods rot upon the wharves, to sit down in bankruptcy and despair, and for what purpose? In order that the nation that had deliberately prepared for this war should have an insuperable advantage over the nations that had to buy their supplies!

Then it was urged that we refuse to permit merchant vessels to arm against the pirate submarine—for the submarine is a pirate. It is not a vessel of war. It is not a part of a fleet. It does not go out seeking an armed enemy. It never attacks an armed ship if it knows it. It attacks unarmed ships, ships of commerce, loaded with merchandise, with passengers, with women and children.

Then we were asked to forbid American citizens from traveling on armed vessels of commerce, and this meant that we should become a hermit Nation, that our people could not travel abroad at all, for we had no merchant marine, and our sole reliance in most cases for foreign travel was upon the ships of the English and the French.

In a similar way, it was urged that we should in no event send troops abroad to fight the enemy, that we should wait until murder and rapine were brought to our very doorway. I can not believe that any right-thinking man really wants to see that. For my own part, as long as I have any official responsibility in the destiny of this Nation, we shall be prepared to meet and defeat every foe beyond the bounds of our own country.

Congress has indignantly repelled all of these suggestions and has kept its eye fixed upon the bright guidon of national unity and national honor.

To me the parting of the ways came more than a year before the declaration of war. On the 24th of February, 1916, a former chairman of the Committee on Foreign Relations of the Senate of the United States wrote to President Wilson demanding that American citizens be forbidden to travel on armed ships of commerce. President Wilson refused, and in that refusal he struck what is to me the high note of American statesmanship and American honor. The President pointed out that he had thus far succeeded in keeping the country out of war, and that the people well understood his purpose in that regard, but that the undersea campaign of the Germanic allies was making it increasingly difficult to maintain peace with honor under the rules of international law; that the acts of the rulers of Germany were so widely different from their promises that it was difficult to reconcile the one with the other, but that he still hoped that some explanation might be found for their conduct.

He then continues:

But in any event our duty is clear. No nation, no group of nations, has the right while war is in progress to alter or disregard the principles which all nations have agreed upon in mitigation of the horrors and sufferings of war, and if the clear rights of American citizens should ever unhappily be abridged or denied by any such action we should, it seems to me, have in honor no choice as to what our own course should be. For my own part I can not consent to any abridgment of the rights of American citizens in any respect. The honor and self-respect of the Nation are involved. We covet peace and shall preserve it at any cost but the loss of honor. To forbid our people to exercise their rights for fear we might be called upon to vindicate them would be a deep humiliation, indeed.

Aye, it would. To say to an American citizen that he may not exercise the rights of a citizen of a sovereign State; that he may not travel beyond the bounds of his own country upon errands of commerce, upon errands of science, upon errands of mercy, or even as the diplomatic or consular representative of his own Government except at the peril of his life, for fear, forsooth, that his Government might be called upon to vindicate his rights as a citizen, would be an indelible stain upon American honor.

Why, a year before that, on May 13, 1915, after the sinking of the *Lusitania*, when we warned Germany that she must not attack noncombatants on the high seas, our Secretary of State presented the same principle. He said:

American citizens act within their indisputable rights in taking their ships and in traveling wherever their legitimate business calls them upon the high seas, and exercise those rights in what should be the well-

justified confidence that their lives will not be endangered by acts done in clear violation of universally acknowledged international obligations, and certainly in the confidence that their own Government will sustain them in the exercise of their rights.

Why, when the blow fell, it became apparent that the path of dishonor would not have been the path of safety. On February 1, 1917, the Imperial German Government issued its mandate that it purposed to sink all ships, armed and unarmed, friendly and belligerent, without regard to their character, their contents, or their destination, if it found them upon the high seas. When that occurred, when the black flag had been hoisted against civilization, the President of the United States came before Congress and he gave it one clear message. The men of Congress, without regard to political affiliations, responded with one vote and the American people have ratified it with one voice, and that is that the sovereign rights of American citizens shall be protected anywhere against any nation on earth! [Applause.]

When we entered this war, therefore, we entered for the defense of the undoubted rights of the American people under every principle of international law; rights we were able to defend when we were a weak and struggling Nation, and are we less able to defend them now that we have grown strong and great? We are for peace; but as President Wilson has said, the right is more precious than peace. If it were not so, we would not to-day be the independent Nation that we are.

We fought England, our motherland, a second time in 1812 for less outrages upon our citizens at sea than we have suffered at the hands of the German Empire. England never claimed the right to sink our ships, to destroy our property, to murder our citizens. All she ever claimed was the right to search our ships for deserters from her own navy, and we would not even permit her to do that, although she was the nearest blood relative we had on the globe.

There were high-minded men in this country that thought we should have gone to war when Belgium was invaded. There were dauntless spirits who thought we should have intervened when the *Lusitania* was sunk; but the great majority of the American people preferred to tread the path of peace and neutrality as long as it could be trod with honor. But when we entered this war on the 6th day of April, 1917, we entered clothed not only with the white garment of humanity but with the invincible armor of a strict legal right under every acknowledged principle of international law. This is America's war whether it is anybody else's war or not. Let there be no confusion of thought in any man's mind on that subject.

Our Army goes abroad primarily in vindication of American rights, rights as old as the history of our Republic. But it so chances in the mighty movements of the world's history that our boys go with another and a higher mission. They are the foremost champions and natural defenders of the cause of democracy, the rights of humanity, and the safety of free institutions. We find ourselves allied with all the free governing nations of the world, opposed to the last remnant of autocracy and the miserable sacrilege of the divine right of kings to rule their fellow men.

Democracy must demonstrate its right to live, and to do this it must demonstrate its power to live. It is manifest that if a military autocracy is the only strong and efficient form of government, if it is able to impose its will upon other nations, then it is the only safe form of government, and all men must come under a military autocracy. Democracy can only survive by proving that it is stronger than any other form of government, that it has a stronger hold upon the hearts and minds and purses of its citizens than feudalism.

I am enough of an American to believe that free government can not perish from the earth; that Americans to-day are imbued with the spirit of '76 and are ready to devote "their lives, their fortunes, and their sacred honor" upon the altar of their country's cause. One hundred and forty years ago, when our fathers founded this little Nation upon the fundamental principle of the equal opportunity of all men before the law, some of the boldest of them may have dreamed that it would one day grow into an independent Nation.

But I take it that not even the wildest dreamer among them would have imagined that it would grow into the great, powerful, rich Nation into which it has grown. Equity and opportunity have drawn to these shores millions of liberty-loving men from every land and clime. Loyalty is not a matter of race or creed or lineage or birth; it is a matter of the heart. The true American is loyal to American ideals. The immigrant's son when he puts on the khaki uniform and shoulders his rifle and marches away under the Old Flag of the Union is just as good an American as the man who counts six generations to the Pilgrim Fathers of New England.

I affirm that if there is any man in America who really believes in the divine right of kings to rule their fellow men, he

does not belong under the Stars and Stripes. He ought to get under some other flag. [Applause.]

When our fathers founded this Republic upon the principle of the equal right of all men to govern themselves and to choose the form of government under which they should live not a nation on earth was willing to admit that we could make a success of it. To-day four-fifths of the civilized nations are glad to join hands with us upon the American platform of the rights of man. The American principle has become the dominant political thought of the age.

Our boys will not fight alone. They will fight for the first time in our history with our motherland of England and with our Canadian cousins, from whom we have been too long estranged. They will fight with France—gallant old France! That came so promptly to our aid in the days of our Revolutionary struggle; that sent us Lafayette and Rochambeau; that lent to our starving and destitute Nation millions of money and waited our good time to pay it back, and then remitted all the interest. They will fight with Italy, the home of art and song; with Belgium, bleeding Belgium, ravished to-day by the Huns; with Poland, dreary, desolate Poland, where, under the benign influence of Prussian kultur, all the little children under 10 years of age are dead and rotting by the roadside; with Christian Armenia, ground beneath the bloody heel of the unspeakable Turk; and with Russia, that great Empire just emerging from the darkness of ignorance and misrule into the sunlight of self-government. But if this great Republic with 140 years of freedom can not defend its principles and its people, why should Russia care to be a republic after all?

Our boys will fight under no feudal banner, under no royal ensign, under no flag typifying the divine right of kings to rule. They will fight under Old Glory, the flag of the free. Those boys are imbued with the spirit of 1776. If we support them, they will defend that Old Flag and carry it to victory. They will restore it to us with added luster and added glory. They will not stain it with inhumanity or dishonor, and they will not bring it back until they have made the Kaiser see the Stars and feel the Stripes of a free people.

What that Old Flag means to us we want it to mean to all the world. We have seen that flag through all the dark days of our infant struggle, through starvation and suffering, through privation and peril, through disaster and defeat, until the black midnight of Valley Forge burst into the cloudless dawn at Yorktown. We have seen it wave in victory over Perry at Lake Erie and above the dauntless achievements of Andrew Jackson at New Orleans. We have seen it triumph at Monterey, at Buena Vista, at Cerro Gordo, and at Chapultepec. We have seen it sway to and fro in the mighty storm of the Civil War. We have seen it at the high-water mark of that great struggle upon the field of Gettysburg, where for three long days under the burning sun of July the brothers who wore the blue and the brothers who wore the gray hurled themselves against each other in fratricidal strife until they had proven to themselves and to all the world that they were one in courage, one in race, and one, thank God, in destiny.

We have seen it with Dewey at Manila Bay and with Sampson and Schley at Santiago. And we shall soon see that same Old Flag, a star of hope to the suffering world, carried in triumph across the bleeding fields of France and Belgium, until it is planted in victory and in permanent peace above the last stronghold of feudal power in this world.

Will peace come? Aye; peace will come, but it will be no premature peace; it will be no patched-up peace; it will be no armed truce leading to another awful struggle. It will be no peace with a despot who claims a partnership with Almighty God.

It will be no peace with a monarch who regards the most solemn international obligations as mere scraps of paper.

It will be a peace founded upon the deep faith of nations; a peace between average men; a peace sealed by the voice of the people, above and beyond which we Americans acknowledge no power beneath the throne of God.

Will peace come? When? Peace will come, as President Wilson told the Pope, when the flag of feudalism goes down forever in this world. [Applause.]

Mr. Sisson. Mr. Chairman, I yield 20 minutes to the gentleman from Massachusetts [Mr. Gallivan].

Mr. Gallivan. Mr. Chairman, before beginning I ask unanimous consent to extend, revise, and correct my remarks in the RECORD.

The CHAIRMAN. The gentleman from Massachusetts asks unanimous consent to extend, revise, and correct his remarks. Is there objection?

There was no objection.

Mr. Gallivan. Mr. Chairman, many of us here in the House have at one time and another been deeply interested in the ques-

tion of our soldiers' mails. We have seen one department, in the parlance of the day, pass the buck to another department in an effort to evade the responsibility for an unaccountable delay in the transmission of mail to our boys who are now over there. To my utter surprise and consternation I read in the newspaper a few days ago that an American general, who had been interviewed on this question of soldiers' mail, said that the disturbance which was being raised here in the Congress of the United States was all uncalled for, was a waste of time, and that so far as his men were concerned they were there to fight and not to read letters from home.

Now, I rise at this moment particularly to bring to the attention of the House by contrast the statement of a Massachusetts colonel, now in France, who headed the first State unit of militiamen that ever left this country for service in the present European struggle.

On the 7th day of last September a Massachusetts regiment sailed from an American port. I had the proud distinction and the great privilege of witnessing the departure of that fine regiment of boys from the old Bay State; its colonel has been my lifelong friend; its present membership is composed of what was originally two Massachusetts State militia organizations. As I said before, it was the first State organization to leave America for this war. It is known now as the One hundred and first Infantry. It was formerly the Fighting Ninth and the Dandy Fifth of Massachusetts. Its colonel, Edward L. Logan, a brave, self-sacrificing, devoted young Bostonian, who had graduated from Harvard College, who had acquired a splendid law practice, left here at the head of that regiment, and his regiment was selected because at that time it was the only State regiment in this country which was ready for foreign service. I do not say this in disparagement of the other splendid State troops which have since embarked from these shores, but it even preceded the Rainbow Division about which we have heard so much and from which we have heard so much since the Rainbow Division was sent to France.

For almost eight months these boys from my State have been under the colors in war-torn France. After months of daily instruction in the very latest tactics of modern warfare they were sent to the firing line some eight weeks past. Day and night their gallant colonel has lived with his men and has worked for his men. He ought to know, and he does know, how his men feel on this question of letters from home. His men, their comfort, their well-being, their happiness, under prevailing conditions, are his first concern. He stands by his men all the time and they loyally and devotedly stand by him.

What does Col. Edward L. Logan say in contrast to the Regular Army general, who says that his men are in France to fight and not to read letters from home? I have the message from him, and he lays particular emphasis on this question of the soldiers' mail. Yesterday word came from Col. Logan, and speaking of his boys, most of whom live in my congressional district, I am proud to say, he says:

Tell the mothers that I am doing my best to keep the boys in fine condition, and that the One hundred and first is grateful for all the things done for us by the folks back home. Say that the boys are in excellent health and spirits, but, above all, tell them over there to write and then write some more. Tell them not to wait for the boys to answer; we may be in the trenches all the time. Please tell them to keep in mind that there is nothing in the world so consoling to our boys as to hear from home.

[Applause.]

There is the story of a Massachusetts volunteer colonel now and for many months past right in the midst of things. His regiment has been in action now for over six weeks, and there has not been a single company in the regiment that has not lost some of its men. Already many of the boys have made the supreme sacrifice. Many others have been listed among the wounded. Their colonel has said the most consoling influence of all is found in the letters from those who are keeping the home fires burning. And when any colonel or any general in the American Army over there—I do not care how high or how low his station—says that his men are there to fight and not to read letters from home, I believe that some notice ought to be taken of that statement here in the Congress of the United States, even if it is but that of quoting what he has said. He ought to be jacked up and at once.

Mr. Shallenberger. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. Gallivan. With pleasure.

Mr. Shallenberger. I would call the attention of the gentleman to the fact that not only is Massachusetts entitled to the honor which he has mentioned, but, according to the reports in the public press, the first body of American troops to be complimented for bravery in battle by a foreign commander was a Massachusetts body of soldiers. [Applause.]

Mr. GALLIVAN. I thank the distinguished gentleman from Nebraska. He has but anticipated what I am going to read about another Massachusetts regiment, most of whose boys come from the district of the distinguished acting leader of the minority party, my colleague, Mr. GILLET. "One hundred and twenty-two Massachusetts boys win crosses" read the headlines in all the press of the country yesterday. "Bravery of One hundred and fourth Regiment recognized by France."

In recognition of the bravery of Massachusetts troops in the recent battle of Apremont, the French Government has decorated 122 men, mostly of the One hundred and fourth Regiment, with the cross of war, according to dispatches from army headquarters in the field received in Boston yesterday.

Two chaplains—

One a Catholic priest and one a Protestant minister—

are among the leaders in the honor list and receive high praise in the French citation. Every rank, from captain to private, is included in the roll. The French general making the presentations, according to the dispatches, said, in speaking of the One hundred and fourth Regiment, "It showed the greatest audacity and a fine spirit of sacrifice. Subjected to very violent bombardments and attacked by large German forces, it succeeded in checking the dangerous advance, and took, at the point of the bayonet, in a most vigorous way, prisoners and some demolished trenches from which it had fallen back at the first assault."

I want to read to you what these two chaplains were especially cited for. Chaplain John B. Des Valles, of New Bedford, had this said of him by the French general:

With extraordinary heroism and exceptional devotedness to duty, under uninterrupted fire and at the constant risk of his life, he did not cease to tender aid to the wounded, and he encouraged to renewed efforts the men who were weakened in hard fighting.

He was the Catholic priest. Here is what is said of the Protestant chaplain, Walton S. Danker, of Worcester:

At the time of the attack particularly noteworthy was the devotedness and spirit of sacrifice with which he attended the sick and wounded and bestowed the last rite to the dead. Facing the enemy from April 2 to April 14, particularly on April 10, 12, and 13, he remained in the front-line trenches, encouraging the men during the clash.

Those are two Massachusetts clergymen. God bless them and keep them! I said that practically the entire One hundred and fourth came from the district of the distinguished minority leader [Mr. GILLET], yet I ought not to forget that perhaps every district in Massachusetts can claim some of these boys, and I am glad to be able in this hour to bring to the attention of Congress—and I am thankful to the gentleman from Nebraska [Mr. SHALEBERGER] for suggesting it to me—that this great honor has been conferred on a body of Massachusetts brave boys, and I do not believe that in the history of any war any such distinction ever came at such an early time in the conflict to any regiment.

Col. Logan's regiment has also had honors bestowed on many officers and privates. The war crosses appear on the uniforms of many of his brave boys, and, oh! how proud my people are of that regiment, first State unit to go overseas and first to reach the firing line.

Mr. Chairman, as I said I rose to refer to the question of soldiers' mail, and to quote what Col. Logan, of the One hundred and first Regiment, had sent home here, and I sincerely hope that the efforts of all those Members of Congress who have taken this matter up will not fail.

Mr. ROGERS. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. GALLIVAN. Yes.

Mr. ROGERS. I notice in yesterday's Boston Post a report of the return of the Massachusetts mission sent over there in connection with establishing a registration point for Massachusetts soldiers, and that former Lieut. Gov. Frothingham, a member of that commission, states that he found among all the Massachusetts troops and among the troops generally of the American Expeditionary Forces that the mail service was the one thing that gave them more grief and more anxiety and more trouble than any other single thing.

Mr. GALLIVAN. I want to say to my colleague that I have the same information, and in his absence I read a letter from Col. Logan, of the One hundred and first Regiment, in which he pleads that the folks at home write and keep writing and that the mail service be, if possible, improved. We all want action now.

I want to say something while I am on my feet, Mr. Chairman, about the entire Postal Service to-day.

The past three or four years have seen a steady decline of service efficiency in the post office. So bad have conditions grown that complaint has come from all parts of the country and from all classes of people. Everybody knows it; everybody has felt its disturbing effects. Editorial and news columns of the public press teem with the subject; few Members of this House but what have received many letters of complaint and instance after instance has been related on this floor all tending to show the growing demoralization of the service. Something

is radically wrong and it is a condition which can not be permitted to long continue unchecked.

Eventually the department, admitting that something was sadly the matter, tried to explain by laying the blame on the railroads. Of course, time schedules are out of joint, but this does not explain the wretched local delivery, nor does it explain the discouraging mail service given the soldiers abroad or in the cantonments at home. In fact, instead of the railroads being solely to blame, it can be stated with good show of reason that the excessive time consumed in discharging and loading mail at way stations, due to an inadequate working force, is largely responsible for delayed passenger-train service. We will have to look beyond the railroads to locate the trouble.

THE PROFIT IDEA.

An unbiased and impartial inquiry will lead any investigator to but one conclusion, and that is the present administrative policy of the Post Office Department is responsible for existing evil conditions. In a mad effort to force a postal surplus, and in so doing to play upon a mistaken impression held in some quarters that a profitable service means an efficient one, the Post Office Department, under the guise of economy, has instituted cheeseparing practices and penny-wise and pound-foolish methods until a heretofore excellent service has been disorganized beyond recognition.

In attempting to run the post office on a profit basis when neither the people nor Congress indorses such a policy is a grievous mistake, and to this fundamental error can be traced the multiplied shortcomings of the existing system. This fallacy has impregnated the whole structure with the idea that cost is everything, and this philosophy ramifies through and hangs like a pall over its diversified workings, affecting alike the administrative and operating ends of the business.

Instance after instance could be cited to show how fully these statements square with the facts and how, as a result, the entire service breaks down in an emergency. Instead of making a general survey of the entire service, however, I will content myself by confining these remarks to an analysis of the way the postal profit system works in practice and its ultimate effect upon the city delivery division, a part of the service with which I am most familiar. Similar conditions to those described here exist in all other branches proceeding from the same primary cause.

Mr. MOON. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. GALLIVAN. Certainly.

Mr. MOON. In his criticism of the Post Office Department, does the gentleman not think it would be fair and proper for him to state that in the interest of the prosecution of this war, in order that the freights might have the right of way for the transmission of munitions of war and of soldiers, it has become necessary to take off about one-half of all of the mail trains heretofore used in the United States in the transmission of mail?

Mr. GALLIVAN. The gentleman has stated a fact. I am glad to get that information. I do not know what percentage of the mail trains have been taken off. I am always glad to be informed, and there is nobody in this House who can give us more information upon the subject than the distinguished chairman of the Committee on the Post Office and Post Roads; but my criticism still holds, despite that fact. Before the war our postal system was starting on its backward course. Let us examine into some of the causes.

THE EFFICIENCY SYSTEM.

Post-office clerks and city letter carriers distribute and deliver the mails arriving at free-delivery offices, and they are employed on an eight-hour day basis. This is highly important work, and service efficiency demands that the operating plan of organization be so framed as to facilitate distribution and to insure an unflinching observance by the carrier of regular delivery schedules. Owing to the fact that the daily volume of mail varies to a certain extent, which in post-office terms are known as light and heavy days, instances occur wherein the carrier completes his regular tour of duty in time somewhat less than the full eight hours. Of course, the carrier on such days performs all the work assigned him, but some one in the department at Washington, noting these instances of "undertime"—a technical term since invented by the department to define such cases—conceived the idea that some one was loafing or shirking and at once, for obvious reasons, set about to devise a system that would eliminate "undertime."

It must be apparent to the least familiar that this would be no easy matter. Mail varies in volume, and if the carrier was allotted all he could deliver on light days, when the heavier days come, as they do three or four times a week, and especially in certain seasons on the first few days of each month, naturally he would be overwhelmed by the increased burden. The serv-

ice would suffer, patrons would become discontented, and the carrier, worked to the limit on each and every day, would be lacking in energy and without reserve vitality to successfully handle the peak loads.

Prior to the system being changed the regulations governing carriers' tours of duty provided, in substance, that "all routes should be arranged so that they may be covered within eight hours." This plan worked to the satisfaction of all concerned; efficient service was given; patrons received their mail at regular intervals; and the health and vitality of the employees was kept at a high standard. Despite this gratifying showing, the efficiency experts at Washington demanded a change and change it must be.

THE STANDARD DAY.

Before the new system was placed in operation, however, the department mailed an order which, through the local postmasters, instructed the carriers to furnish certain data, which they were themselves to compile. This data consisted of the number of first, second, third, and fourth class pieces of mail handled on certain days, as well as the number of pieces of postage-due mail and registered matter. Once secured, such data became the basis of calculation on which the efficiency system was later founded.

Here is the way it was done: Adding the several items of mail handled and then dividing the total by the number of carriers and you have the average amount of mail, cased and delivered, per carrier per day.

So far so good. Then add up the time consumed by all the carriers on this day and divide the total by the number of carriers and you have the average time consumed per carrier per day.

Then multiply the number of carriers by eight hours and from this figure subtract the actual number of hours worked as totaled from the records and you have as a result an imposing figure of "undertime," which, if taken among 35,000 carriers, resolves itself into a most convincing argument, favoring the inauguration of an efficiency system to conserve this time.

But this does not complete the system by any means. It is now necessary to compute the time of the carrier by offices. A force of inspectors visit a post office and, on the basis of the above calculation, compute the "undertime" that has occurred in this office during some recent period. Armed with this figure obtained, they then call upon the postmaster, have the supervisory officers brought in, and confront these officials with the damning evidence of their own infamy.

Accordingly the amount of "undertime" having been totaled, routes are ordered rearranged so as to provide for a full eight hours' work on each day. If, for instance, in an office of, say, 9 or 10 carriers, it is found that there has been a weekly average of 48 hours "undertime," it must be plainly evident in the light of this efficiency system that one of these carriers can be dispensed with. It is up to the postmasters to see that routes are rearranged so that this can be done, leaving the remaining carriers to handle the additional work after the order has been rendered effective.

Then to give the system general application and the post-office inspectors a bill of good health an order issues from the department, advising the postmaster that hereafter "carriers' routes should be so arranged as to provide a full eight hours' work at all times." Thus by a system of adding pieces of mail and men and dividing the total by minutes, the department has evolved the wonderful theory of the standard day. After all, could anything be more simple?

Why is it not a great idea? Why will it not work? It is done in the factory by increasing the size of the pulley; it is done in the machine shop by speeding up the lathe and introducing soft steel; it is done on the railroad by building larger locomotives; why can it not be done in the post office? Set a standard; that is the idea. Never mind about local conditions, train schedules, the human element, or what not. Set the standard. If conditions do not exactly fit the standard, bend and hammer and squeeze them in until they do fit. It is up to the postmaster to see that this is done.

THE STANDARD MINUTE.

Here we have the standard day as a scientific formula designating what a day's work should be. To make it further effective, it is but a natural and logical step for the local post-office authorities to subsequently divide the hour into minutes and set a standard minute's work. So they do a little computing on their own account. The stop watch is brought out; the carrier is started with a gong, and an accurate time record is taken in minutes by the watch holder of the pieces of mail he throws, the amount of time he consumes in doing this or that with one or the other class of mail, and then out of this table

of experience thus compiled is evolved another theory—the standard minute.

This is not a satire, gentlemen, framed for passing amusement or a facetiously contrived plot for a literary extravaganza. Rather is it a true-to-life portrayal of a system now operating in the City Delivery Division of the Postal Service, where hard and fast regulations define an acceptable amount of work to be performed in 60 seconds. Not only is there a minute standard, but employees are reduced in grade, transferred, humiliatingly disciplined, or removed from the service, as a case may be, because they can not maintain the pace the minute standard arbitrarily sets.

THE SYSTEM AT WORK.

The Post Office Department having sponsored and sanctioned this system, it is but natural that the inspector force would shortly become saturated with the same idea. Realizing that their tenure of place depended almost entirely on the favor of the Postmaster General has caused many postmasters to catch the craze, and to such an extent that new-fangled speed-up devices, efficiency charts, rules, and regulations have followed one another with painful regularity, until it is impossible to catalogue the variety of methods thus invoked. Everything must be done by rule. Tasks are measured by minutes, minutes by seconds, and seconds by physical movements.

The robust and active carrier is singled out as the basis for computation. His capacity is utilized as a measuring device to frame the tasks set for other carriers, who with unsparing exactness must be standardized accordingly. Somehow, some way, the standard must be maintained, no matter how much speeding up is required, because he who can not stand the pace can fall by the wayside. Even instances have occurred where carriers were ordered to count the number of their steps taken during the day.

Such is the efficiency system, its origin, its history, its application. The corner stone of the system is the standard day. Its purpose is to wring from the toiler the last ounce of possible effort. Its ultimate object throughout its varied ramifications is to force a postal surplus and to prove how the present administration of the Post Office transcends in capacity all those that have gone before.

REORGANIZATION.

Such is the efficiency system. How does it work out in practice? What are the results of its operation, general and specific, immediate and remote? Answering my own question, I charge this so-called efficiency system with being an utter failure, and that, too, after judging it fairly and from every point of view. It has well-nigh destroyed the efficiency of a heretofore satisfying service; it has shaken the confidence of the people and awakened protest without end; it has goaded the employees into almost open rebellion, driven competent men from the service in despair, depressed the morale and health of the workers, and inspired a discontent that now runs rife throughout the entire structure. Even more. From a standpoint of social economy the system has been a hopeless and a disastrous financial experiment. It has ignominiously failed, first of all, because it is founded on a fallacy and because it left out of reckoning the one most important item—the human element.

Examining in detail, this is how the plan works in practice: The efficiency system has been launched; it is on its way and a reorganization of certain post offices begun—reorganization being a polite departmental term meaning reduction in the force. In due time a number of post-office inspectors show up in a particular post office where are employed, we may say, some 60 letter carriers. At once begins the scheme of scientific computation, and it is discovered that these 60 carriers have averaged 7 hours and 35 minutes per carrier per day in casing and distributing mail.

Not much "undertime" for one man, to be sure; but lo and behold, when you multiply it by 60 you have the amazing total of 1,500 minutes per day "undertime"; 1,500 minutes means 25 hours, which in turn means 3 workdays of 8 hours each, and, what is more to the point, means that three carriers, according to this system, can be dispensed with. Reorganization begins, and nothing is easier. The postmaster is simply ordered to reduce his carrier force by three men, and arrange the remaining routes accordingly. Protest unavailing, the orders are obeyed. The inspectors leave town, bent on more reorganization. The postmaster is left behind to toy with his new-found system, and then trouble, dire trouble, begins.

The first division of districts will not work at all. Many carriers have plainly too much mail to handle, so that in rectifying this inequality chunks of territory are switched back and forth from this route to that like diplomats at a peace conference,

seeking vainly for some equitable plan of settlement. Meanwhile, the patron daily sees a new face at his door, and a strange voice inquires his name. Substitutes are drafted in number to care for the accumulated mail as the adjustment goes on. Still it fails, so speed-up methods are invoked. The official whip is cracked; men are nagged, hounded, and hurried; complaints pile into the office, and everything is in an uproar.

Still the system does not work, but admission of this fact can not be officially made by the postmaster who knows how the information would be received at Washington. Schedules are thrown out of joint, regularity of delivery vanishes, and mail accumulates in the office. This carrier has too much; he is hours late on his trip, so he must curtail service to one delivery a day. Another carrier is covered up, so he takes out first-class mail only, leaving an accumulation of newspapers, periodicals, and other mail matter. Later, a substitute is drafted to clear up this wreckage, and patrons are surprised to get three or four missing issues of their daily paper on one delivery. Still another carrier, nervously anxious to escape official reprimand, resorts to all sorts of questionable expedients to dispose of his mail, to later answer more serious complaint.

Meanwhile a heavy day comes along and a large volume of mail arrives at the office. The working force is swamped; mail piles up, and for the purpose of getting out the most important, first-class mail is given the preference, while other classes being switched from pillar to post, instead of being handled once, are pawed over five or six times. More substitutes are requisitioned and assigned to strange territory, adding to the confusion. One delivery in residence sections becomes the regular order, and out-bound mail lies over in street letter boxes for 24 hours before being collected.

That this picture is not overdrawn can be readily confirmed by a talk with postal employees or by a careful analysis of the figures furnished by the department itself. Take the case of the substitute, for instance: This year an appropriation to cover this item calls for \$4,100,000, a jump of more than \$2,000,000 within the past few years. Deduct from this estimate \$1,352,864 for pay of substitutes working in place of 34,592 carriers off on vacation and there is left \$2,747,136 to be expended for auxiliary and temporary hire of substitute carriers. Why this immense sum? It means that aside from vacation periods the average carrier must be helped out by a substitute to the extent of 27 days during the year, and this makes no allowance for an ever-increasing item of overtime the regular carrier is compelled to work.

From 1909 to 1915 there were 59 carriers reduced to the substitute list, while in 1915, 1916, 1917, at a time when postal revenues were increasing by leaps and bounds, 729 carriers were thus reduced. Why is it that the carrier force was only increased 1.4 per cent last year, while postal revenues increased 5.66 per cent? The postal receipts of 1917 amounted to \$42,477,951 more in 1917 than in 1915, yet the cost of City Delivery Service was exactly \$4,773.96 more in 1917 than in 1915. Imagine a concern doing an increased business of \$42,000,000 on an increased overhead of \$4,000.

NO WONDER THE SERVICE IS DEMORALIZED.

Unsatisfactory as has been the handling of first-class mail it has been infinitely better than the service given other classes, which has been miserable beyond reckoning, and which mail has been allowed to accumulate in terminals and in post offices to an amazing degree. A million dollars' worth of registered matter, a short time ago, was lost for 14 days in such an accumulation in New York City before being discovered. The postmaster in Washington, during the month of January this year, while denying the charge that mail was being held up for a period of three weeks, admitted to a congestion 24 hours behind schedule. Conditions pictured as existed in the Chelsea Terminal of the New York office have been little less than frightful. Here is an extract from the Manufacturers' Record, which I will insert, showing where daily papers regularly arrived three and four issues at one delivery:

WOULD BE WELCOMED—THE COUNTRY HAS NO OBJECTION TO SECRETARY BURLERSON RESIGNING.

A dispatch from Washington says that Postmaster General Burleson is seriously considering retirement from the Cabinet in order to enter the race in Texas for the United States Senate, and it adds, "Burleson is known to be thoroughly tired of department service."

It is to be hoped that these statements are correct, for Mr. Burleson is certainly no more "tired of departmental service" than the country is tired of the kind of departmental service which it has been receiving from the post office since long before our entrance into the war.

Typical of these conditions are the receipt by the writer in Daytona, Fla., on Saturday, of the Baltimore papers issued in Baltimore on the preceding Monday, and sometimes the delay is even greater. Boston papers have been exactly one week in coming from the Hub of New England. As there is no such delay in the trains coming South it is very evident that the difficulty is in the post office. Take, for instance, the Baltimore morning papers, sent out of that city somewhere between midnight and 3 o'clock Monday morning, and remember that they reach Daytona late Saturday afternoon. Some days three or four issues of the same paper, but of different dates, are received by the writer in the

same mail. This condition, which goes on from day to day, is typical of post-office service. There is often a difference of as much as 24 hours in the receipt of two copies of the Manufacturers' Record, for instance, mailed in Baltimore at exactly the same time.

We sincerely trust that the rumor sent out from Washington, that Postmaster Burleson is considering retirement, is correct, and that he will not only consider it, but will act favorably upon the matter.

Here is an unintended, and for that reason more severe, indictment of the present Postal Service contained in a letter from Theodore Hewes, of Indianapolis, Ind., addressed to dog fanciers, which begins as follows:

For once in the history of our country we find it next to impossible to get second or third class mail delivered with any degree of accuracy.

This writer evidently has so lost confidence in the Postal Service that, although having a month to spare, will not trust his communications to second or third class mail, but sends them first class instead.

DOG FANCIERS, THIS IS A PERSONAL LETTER TO YOU.

INDIANAPOLIS, IND., February 2, 1918.

For once in the history of our country we find it next to impossible to get second or third class mail delivered with any degree of accuracy. Many of the dog shows have been seriously crippled this year for lack of entries, due, in the majority of cases, to the delay in receiving premium lists. For that reason the premium lists and entry blanks of the Indianapolis Kennel Club are mailed to you under first-class postage.

The dog shows of this country never were up against such trying conditions as they are to-day, and show managers that have the courage to go ahead in the face of present conditions are certainly entitled to your most liberal patronage. The snow blockade, we can reasonably figure, will be out of the way by March 1, so that need not delay your entries. But there are other matters that only the experienced show managers take into account, i. e., the question of expressing shipments. You have been having trouble in getting your shipments accepted, and are likely to have trouble unless you take the matter up with your local agent in advance, and it is this matter that has called forth this letter. I have arranged with the express companies in Indianapolis to furnish sufficient room for all dogs shipped, even though they may arrive two days in advance of the show. And owners or handlers may have the privilege of going to the storehouse and taking their dogs out for exercise. I have also arranged with the Denison Hotel (the headquarters of the dog exhibitors in this city) to allow toy dogs to be brought to the hotel in advance of the show, provided the owners are with them.

FANCIERS, IT IS UP TO YOU.

We have done our bit. Will you do yours? You owe it to yourself, you owe it to the fancy, and, above all else, you owe it to your country to see to it that the Indianapolis show, March 1, 2, and 3, is up to standard. And let us show to the world that, regardless of war, we are doing our bit to keep the industry up to the highest standard.

Now, then, do this much for me: Make the largest entry you have ever made at any show. Come with your exhibit if possible. Talk dogs, preach dogs, and in the right way get others interested in the breeding and exhibiting of dogs.

If your local express agent has any hesitancy in accepting your dogs for shipment, make it a point to leave one or two days ahead of time and show him this letter as proof that we will take care of them on arrival.

Yours, for the best dog show ever caged in the Middle West,
THEO. HEWES.

Similar cases could be submitted in convincing number and these would not represent the smallest fraction of the inefficiency that permeates the service, because the delays, omissions, and mishandling of mails are a sort of an intangible thing. Everybody feels it; everybody experiences it, yet to secure specific and definite evidence of the excessive time consumed in the interval between depositing a letter in a street letter box and the hour of its delivery at its destination involves so much trouble that few people are willing to assume the rather thankless task. This is what the Broadway Association of New York did last year, and their findings confirmed not only the prevailing opinion of poor service and unexplainable irregularity of delivery but they also showed that in some instances from 24 to 36 hours was used in local deliveries just a few blocks from the point of mailing.

It was possible a few years ago to examine the two postmarks on a letter and ascertain the time a letter was received in the office of mailing and the time it reached the office of its destination, and thus estimate the intervening time consumed in transit. This is no longer possible, because on the plea of economy the practice of postmarking a letter at the office of its destination has been discontinued, and consequently the letter may be held up indefinitely en route and the patron has no check to indicate the point of delay. It is even stated with good authority that the postmark hour at the office of mailing now means little or nothing, because a speeded-up office force have no time to change the postmark at hourly intervals and one impress sometimes serves for 12 hours.

THE SYSTEM AND THE PATRON.

The most grievous sufferer under this efficiency system is the post-office patron. With rearrangement of routes followed by belated or discontinued deliveries, he finds that where formerly his mail reached him about 8 o'clock in the morning he now receives it at 10. Redistricting often puts his place of business at the end of the carrier's newly enlarged route, and then it becomes a matter of grave uncertainty when his mail will arrive. Regularity of schedule has vanished, his day's work has been upset, and his time has been lost along with his

temper. Due to this delay, consignments of merchandise may await dispatch for an additional day; financial deals are held up; appointments are oftentimes broken; and a variety of business activities must mark time, waiting on the mail. Under the fair name of efficiency and for the purpose of saving the salary paid a \$3-a-day employee, this mischievous and perverted administrative method stumbles on its broken way, leaving a trail of dislocated business connections and discontented people to mark its progress.

THE STANDARD GAIT.

But there is still another angle to this efficiency system. Formerly the carrier was assigned a route, which was by and large considered a fair day's work, taking one day with another. If he moved briskly and energetically, it often happened that he could complete his tour of duty within the full eight-hour day. This fact largely explains why the average time recorded among a group of carriers would be 7 hours and 35 minutes—a condition which so notably attracted the attention of the efficiency experts. Working under the new efficiency system, the carrier discovered that no matter how he might hurry there was always more work piled up before him, and if he was not called on to work overtime he at least must stay the full eight hours. Naturally, in view of the excellent examples offered by those in authority, it would be surprising, indeed, if he did not do a little standardizing on his own account and adopt a standard gait.

Men thus situated, given least to worry, go about their work in a machine-like methodical fashion, deaf to complaint or criticism, losing the pride of performance and trudging along in sullen resentment against a system that stifles initiative and sentences the intelligent toiler to be a numbered cog in a scientifically adjusted machine. Carriers of more nervous temperament worry under the strain, the constant nagging and driving, resulting finally in illness or disability. Statistics of letter carriers' sick-benefit associations show by the physician's statement that 60 per cent of illness in the ranks is due to "overwork and worry."

THE SYSTEM AND EMPLOYEES' HEALTH.

Such statements find confirmation in a table taken from the Bulletin of August, 1917, issued by the Department of Labor, and which I will insert, showing that in a compilation of sick-benefit statistics, taken from benefits paid to 18 large craft organizations, the letter carrier stands at the very head in the enumeration of hazardous occupations. This, too, despite the prevailing belief that the letter carrier has a healthy job.

Statistics compiled by the National Sick Benefit Association, with a membership numbering some 15,000 letter carriers, shows that one letter carrier in less than every seven is disabled, through illness or accident, in excess of five weeks during the year. The following table, which I will insert, compiled by the same association, shows that disability through illness or accident has increased 38 per cent since this speed-up efficiency system has been installed:

Nature and extent of disability benefits paid, average membership, frequency and duration of disabilities, and per capita cost of cash benefits, 16 national or international trade-unions.

[From Bulletin, Department of Labor, August, 1917.]

Fund number.	Waiting period (days).	Maximum benefit period (days).	Period covered.	Average annual membership.	Average annual number of cases (all disabilities).	Average annual number of cases per member.	Average annual days of disability per member (all disabilities).	Rate of benefits per week.	Annual cost of cash benefits per member.
1	7	78	1912-1916	236	43	0.18	4.5	\$12.00	\$8.94
2	7	182	1912-1916	10,017	1,359	0.14	4.5	10.00	5.00
3	7	112	1912-1915	13,584	1,551	0.11	3.3	7.00	3.27
4	7	91	1915	50,000	5,246	0.11	4.2	5.40	2.67
5	7	700	1912-1916	886	114	0.13	5.00	5.00	4.26
6	7	91	1914-1916	37,503	3,296	0.09	3.7	5.00	2.23
7	7	91	1911-1915	47,272	(*)	(*)	5.00	4.32	
8	7	91	1912-1916	6,431	596	0.09	3.5	5.00	2.03
9	7	42	1912-1916	4,433	287	0.07	1.1	5.00	.79
10	7	70	1912-1916	12,536	751	0.06	5.00	5.00	1.61
11	14	91	1912-1916	37,894	3,197	0.08	3.1	5.00	1.82
12	14	70	1912-1916	1,788	95	0.05	2.0	5.00	1.16
13	14	112	1911-1915	28,851	1,831	0.06	2.8	5.00	1.68
14	14	84	1912-1915	15,533	624	0.04	1.7	5.00	1.03
15	14	91	1912-1916	6,075	335	0.05	2.0	4.00	1.14
16	14	91	1915	3,890	371	0.10	(*)	3.00	1.59

* Benefits for accidents begin at once.

* Estimate.

* 50 weeks in each two years.

* Not reported.

* Females are paid \$3 per week.

Data relative to benefits paid to members of the United States Letter Carriers' National Sick Benefit Association, 1915-1917.

Year ending June 30—	Average membership.	Benefits paid.	Average benefit per member.
1913.....	8,230	\$3,230.30	\$4.28
1914.....	10,826	47,881.71	4.40
1915.....	11,480	56,675.13	4.93
1916.....	13,740	\$2,355.78	5.99
1917.....	14,931	\$7,812.28	6.59

NOTE.—During the years 1916 and 1917 the benefits paid were \$10 per week, as against \$6 per week in the previous years. This was an increase of 11 per cent in benefits. Benefits paid 1917, \$6.59; in 1913, \$4.28, an increase of \$2.31 or 0.539 per cent. Allow for natural increase of 0.11 per cent due to increase in benefits, and we have a real increase of 0.429 per cent.

Average annual number of cases of disability (all causes) per member.

Year.	Average membership.	Number cases disability.	Average.
1913.....	8,230	956	4.116
1914.....	10,826	1,350	1.235
1915.....	11,480	1,588	1.38
1916.....	13,740	2,101	1.53
1917.....	14,931	2,287	1.54

Total increase of 0.038, or an increase of 0.32 per cent.

THE SYSTEM AND ITS ACTUAL COST.

Not alone, however, has this system of scientific efficiency demoralized the Postal Service, disrupted an efficient organization, shaken the people's confidence in one of their own institutions, and lowered the health and morale of postal employees, but it has also proved itself to be one of the most wastefully extravagant experiments ever conducted by a considerable business enterprise in the country.

Of course, a financial exhibit of postal expenditures may show that a million or two dollars have been apparently saved through its application in the City Delivery Division alone, but this exhibit by no means tells the whole story.

Is it worth anything to have a contented and responsive working force?

Is it worth anything to maintain in high vigor the health and vitality of an army of postal employees?

Is it worth anything to hold the confidence of the people in one of their own institutions?

Is it worth anything to surround men with an environment that stimulates individual initiative and promotes intellectual development? Such things can not be measured by dollars nor can they be translated into mere bookkeeping entries. This recapitulation is enough to everlastingly condemn the system, but let us judge it from a purely material standpoint and we will find that, financially speaking, it has failed hopelessly.

THE PROFIT TEST.

For every dollar the system claims to have saved in reducing postal expenses—business owned by the people, let us not forget—it has cost the people a hundred dollars in some other way. Let us center our gaze on the system in operation. The working force is reduced one carrier and eight hours' work, meaning \$3 is thus presumably saved. In consequence the service is thrown out of gear, deliveries fail, and the thousand and one things flowing from a dislocated service happen.

Hundreds of people consume accumulated minutes waiting for their mail; business deals are held up; appointments are interrupted; shipments are delayed, and one loss after another falls upon the patron and those awaiting his orders, which, if it were possible to total in dollars, would make comparison with the amount alleged to be saved that would be unspeakably absurd. As an example of how the system works, I ask you to look in some day at the stamp window of any of the post-office stations in this city, where the same post-office clerk weighs and names the rate on parcel-post packages and has charge of stamp sales. Instead of employing an additional clerk, one man looks after all this work, with the result that the finances of the Post Office Department show \$3 saved and fully 500 people lose each from 5 to 15 minutes waiting on service. Were the people familiar with the multitude of injuries they have suffered through having the commendable purpose of efficiency twisted and perverted out of all shape or meaning by a squad of egotistical, tinkering experimenters, inspired by an utterly selfish motive, they would make short shrift of them and in less time than it takes me to explain the workings of their so-called efficiency system.

The system is a hopeless financial failure, just as it is in every other way. Nothing good can be said in its defense. It

is philosophically unsound and it is based on an utter misconception of the proper relations of the Post Office to the people and the worker to his work. It must go. May an aroused public indignation force a little common sense and sanity into the understanding of the Postmaster General and his staff and cause them to abandon a policy founded on fallacy and altogether costly and dangerous in its execution. In its stead give the people a sound business administration of the Postal Service, based upon a wise policy sensibly followed.

Mr. Sisson. Mr. Chairman, I yield 10 minutes to the gentleman from Tennessee [Mr. BYRNS].

Mr. BYRNS of Tennessee. Mr. Chairman, I have claimed the indulgence of the House for the purpose of making a correction of the Record, which does an injustice to a very capable and a very faithful employee of the Senate and House and also to members of the Capitol police force. During the consideration of the legislative, executive, and judicial appropriation bill a colloquy occurred between the gentleman from New York [Mr. SANFORD] and myself in regard to the Capitol police, and I shall read a portion of that colloquy:

Mr. SANFORD. Will the gentleman tell the House on whose recommendation the 100 policemen are appointed?

Mr. BYRNS of Tennessee. I do not know.

Mr. SANFORD. If the gentleman will look into it, he will find we have got about 80 policemen out of the 100.

Mr. BYRNS of Tennessee. I will say to the gentleman that none of them were appointed on my recommendation.

Mr. SANFORD. The chief tells us that he can use about 30 out of the hundred.

Now, of course, we all know that the gentleman from New York [Mr. SANFORD], whom we all esteem and respect as one of the most capable, the most earnest, and most faithful Representatives upon the floor of this Chamber, would not intentionally do anyone an injustice, and I may say personally I have a very warm regard for him. But the statement as made does an unintentional injustice to the captain of the Capitol police, Mr. M. B. Louthan, and I wish to read to the committee a statement which has been furnished me, showing the facts in reference to the employment and assignment of the Capitol police. He says:

In reply to statement made on floor of the House by Representative SANFORD March 14 wherein he claims there are 100 policemen on roll and that the chief had told him there were only 30 working at one time, and wanted to know where the other 70 were.

The facts are there are 97 policemen; 16 of these are in House Office Building and not under the supervision of the police captain. In the department under Capt. Louthan there are 81 men. This includes the Capitol and grounds and Senate Office Building. They are divided into three shifts, working as follows: Shift No. 1 from 8 a. m. to 4 p. m., shift No. 2 from 4 p. m. to 12 midnight, shift No. 3 from 12 midnight to 8 a. m., as per report attached, showing the distribution of men on February 13, showing where every man of the entire 81 is located and the hours he works.

There could be no grounds for the statement made by Representative SANFORD, and the chief claims he never told him he was only using 30 men, but did tell him he was using every one of the 81 men every day, as the reports of the three lieutenants attached will show.

By observing the attached sheets you will see that many posts where policemen are needed are vacant on account of having no men to place there.

These men work every day in the year, Sunday included, and are given 50 days leave every year, this because they work Sundays. The three sheets show 77 men at work, and the 4 officers make 81 total men in the department.

Now, I hold in my hand the sheets or lists referred to showing just where the various 77 policemen are stationed, and this statement also shows a number of places where it is considered essential that policemen should be assigned, but can not be assigned because they have not a sufficient number. These lists are entirely too lengthy, and I consider it unnecessary to insert them in the Record.

Now, Mr. Chairman, before I yield the floor I wish to take advantage of this opportunity to refer in a very brief manner to the splendid record which has been made by every county of the sixth congressional district of Tennessee which I have the honor to represent in its subscriptions to the third liberty loan and also in subscriptions made to previous liberty loans and other war activities. It is a record which is characteristic of those liberty loving and patriotic people, for they have never failed to respond to an appeal of their Government.

The afternoon paper tells us that up to the present time, with nearly a week to go so far as the campaign is concerned, there have been 12,000,000 subscribers, which are already 3,000,000 more than subscribed to the second liberty loan. This indicates that the subscriptions to this loan are being taken largely by people of moderate means rather than by the wealthier classes and that is a very gratifying fact to all of us, for it shows that the people of this country, with practical unanimity, are responding to their duty and to their obligations to make necessary sacrifices and do their bit here in order to sustain our soldiers who are being sent over to fight our battles for us. I have only general information as to what has been subscribed

and contributed by all the counties in my district save one, but I know that there has been no lack of patriotism in any of them. Recently the Rotary Club of the city of Nashville, which like the rotary clubs of all other cities is composed of some of the most patriotic, prominent, and most enterprising and forward-looking young business men of the city, collected information as to some of the things the citizenship of Nashville has done to aid the Government since the beginning of the war, and this club has sent this information out to all other cities of similar size in the United States and in Canada with a challenge to those cities to show whether or not they hold a record equal to that made by Nashville. This record shows:

In the first liberty loan Nashville was allotted \$3,120,429.58, and Nashville subscribed \$4,381,650.

In the second liberty loan Nashville was allotted \$4,511,420.96, and Nashville subscribed \$6,642,600.

In the third liberty loan Nashville was allotted \$4,800,000, and although this liberty-loan campaign does not close until May 4, Nashville has already subscribed over \$5,000,000.

In the Red Cross drive Nashville was allotted \$150,000, and subscribed \$185,000, of which over 97 per cent has been paid.

In the Army Y. M. C. A. campaign Nashville was asked for \$40,000, and agreed at the beginning of the campaign to raise \$75,000, and actually subscribed \$94,000.

In the campaign for "Eyes for the Navy," Nashville furnished more than 500 pairs of glasses.

In the campaign for books for our soldiers Nashville furnished 47,518 volumes.

In the campaign for clothes for the relief of Belgium, Nashville was asked for a carload, and furnished one and a half carloads, estimated second-hand value over \$50,000.

Nashville was asked for \$8,000 for Y. W. C. A. rest-room buildings at different cantonments. Nashville gave \$13,500.

More than 50 representative business men of Nashville are now in the religious and army work of the Y. M. C. A.

Nashville furnished one complete medical unit, composed of 12 leading physicians, 21 nurses, and 45 enlisted men, who are now in France.

Nashville is one of only nine cities in the United States showing improvement in condition of their boys since the war began, as reported by executive secretary of Boys' Club Federation of America.

Permit me to say, Mr. Chairman, that the outstanding feature of the splendid record which has been made by the citizenship of Nashville is contained in the fact that there is an improved showing, physical, mental, and moral, among its boys. From some of the belligerent countries there comes a saddening story of the devastating effect war conditions have had on the rising generations of these countries, as shown in increased delinquency and tendency to mental and moral deterioration. Happily the communities of our own beloved land have so far counteracted any such blighting influence, and not only have maintained the high record which had been reached in times of peace, but have actually improved conditions in this respect. I am proud to say that Nashville stands among the five foremost cities who have shown the greatest improvement in this regard. Mr. Chairman, I am deeply thankful and justly proud that Nashville gives a shining example in this galaxy of communities who have preserved the most precious possession of a Christian State, the budding promise of an upright, intelligent, patriotic, and God-serving citizenship. It appears to be, unhappily, an impression with some that the price of this stupendous struggle for the maintenance of the integrity of democratic States includes a certain deterioration of the moral standard of a portion of the rising generation. I am thankful, Mr. Chairman, that this theory is in error, and can not too strongly emphasize this fact, and take particular pleasure in placing the example of the citizens of Nashville and that of other cities in America before this honorable body. It is written in the fates that we will win, for right must triumph over might, as light dispels darkness; but the price will be too heavy if it carries with it the penalty of blighting the coming generation with the loss of ideal and the solid characteristics of honest worth and moral uprightness. It is not true, Mr. Chairman, that we can not win and at the same time raise even higher the standard of our rising citizenship, and I am gratified to be able to submit the proof that this result can be attained as a matter of permanent record. [Applause.]

Mr. MAPES. Will the gentleman yield?

Mr. BYRNS of Tennessee. I will yield.

Mr. MAPES. In regard to the colloquy which the gentleman had with Representative SANFORD, of New York, about the number of police that the chief said he could make use of, did the statement which the gentleman read here come from the chief or some other officer?

Mr. BYRNS of Tennessee. It came from Capt. Louthan, at the head of the Capitol police here, I will say to the gentleman.

Mr. MAPES. Did the gentleman consult the chief to ascertain just what the chief did say?

Mr. BYRNS of Tennessee. Well, my information is that the chief states that he did have a conversation with our friend, the gentleman from New York [Mr. SANFORD], but there has evidently been a misunderstanding on the part of the gentleman from New York. The chief was evidently speaking to the gentleman with reference to the number of men on each of the shifts, whereas the gentleman from New York evidently assumed he was referring—

Mr. MAPES. But did the gentleman from Tennessee consult with the chief?

Mr. BYRNS of Tennessee. I did not personally see the chief.

Mr. MAPES. So that the gentleman can not give the chief's own interpretation of the conversation to which the gentleman from New York referred?

Mr. BYRNS of Tennessee. No; but I feel sure from what has been told me that the chief was referring to men on each of the three shifts, whereas the gentleman from New York evidently had in mind the entire force.

Mr. Sisson. Mr. Chairman, I yield 20 minutes to the gentleman from New York [Mr. LONDON].

Mr. LONDON. Mr. Chairman, the cables bring the news that the Socialists of Austria-Hungary have been organizing for to-day, the 1st of May, nation-wide demonstrations in favor of universal peace, of a peace without conquest and without annexations.

That the Austrian people are weary of this war is apparent to the most superficial observer. It is only the physical coercion, exercised by the overweening German junkerism, that keeps Austria in the fight. While the so-called peace with Russia, and particularly with Ukraine, is defended as a "bread peace," a sort of a truce to obtain the much-needed bread, the Austrian people realize that further subjection to Prussian domination involves a renewal of the struggle with Russia, and that only by universal peace, based upon the right of each nation to live an unmolested life, could a genuine peace be secured. From her internal experience Austria knows well that there is nothing more unstable than a peace based upon the oppression of one people by another.

The Socialists of Austria-Hungary are organizing peace demonstrations. We shall later know to what extent such demonstrations are taking place in Germany where international socialism has been steadily gaining ground at the expense of the so-called social patriots or Government Socialists.

You will recall that the 1st of May has in recent times, even before the war, been awaited in all countries and particularly in monarchical countries as the culminating day for manifestations of unrest. It carried an ominous threat to monarchical institutions on the Continent of Europe.

The 1st of May has special significance for the socialists. Some 25 years before the declaration of war, at an international Socialist congress, where representatives of the socialists of the world were assembled, the resolution was reached that the 1st of May should be celebrated as an international holiday by the Socialists and by labor throughout all countries. It was the first time in the history of the world that such a holiday was established. Men of all religions, of all nations, of all races were to unite on that day in demonstrations of the growing sentiment of international solidarity. They were everywhere to emphasize the ideals of universal peace and to seek everywhere better conditions and a larger measure of political and industrial liberty for the masses. They were everywhere to attempt to reduce to practice that noble ethical conception, recognized by all religious systems, that mankind is one family, and that all men are brothers. The day was to be consecrated to the religion of humanity.

It was not by any means an easy thing to carry out the resolution. The Governments of Germany, Austria, and Russia particularly looked upon these demonstrations as a foreboding of their downfall. Many a 1st of May demonstration ended in bloodshed. It met with as little favor with the Governments as with employers. When the 1st of May fell on a week day the Socialists were compelled in most places to organize their demonstrations in the evening. In one of the prisons of Siberia where a number of revolutionists were confined, they found no other way of celebrating the 1st of May than by burning their shirts. The Socialists adopted the French Marseillaise as their international hymn.

It is this emphasis of international solidarity by the socialists of the world that has given rise to the accusation made usually by the uninformed, or by those who know better but who are interested in suppressing the truth, that socialism is antina-

tional. Nothing is further from the truth. Internationalism necessarily means cooperation among nations. It presupposes the existence of nations. It presupposes the right of a group of mankind, with a distinct language or a distinct culture, to exist alongside with similar groups. All that internationalism means is that a code of international right shall prevail in the relations of nations. The socialist code repudiates the rule of physical supremacy among nations. The socialists would have every nation constitute a member of a well-ordered international family, and would repudiate the rule of physical force in the relations among nations as civilized societies have learned to repudiate it in the relations among individual members of a community.

I have on numerous previous occasions called your attention to the magnificent efforts made by the socialists of the world to oppose militarism, to combat imperialism, and to contend against colonial acquisitions. In a pamphlet called *The Policy of the International*—it can be obtained in the Congressional Library—you will find a detailed recital of the efforts made by the socialists of Europe to prevent the Balkan wars from extending to the rest of Europe, as well as of the steps taken by the International Socialist Bureau and by the European socialists to prevent the present war.

Up to the very last minute there were mass demonstrations against war in Germany. The pamphlet contains a speech of and an interview with Camille Huysmans, the secretary of the International Socialist Bureau and a member of the Belgian Parliament and of the Brussels City Council.

In speaking of a meeting held by the executive committee of the International Socialist Bureau on July 29, five days before the outbreak of the war, Huysmans said:

At that meeting it was agreed to strengthen again the action against war and to support the proposition that the Austro-Serbian dispute should be submitted to arbitration. The German and French members went home with the mission, on the one hand, to insist at Berlin that the Austrian Government should be reasonable in its demands, and, on the other hand, to insist at Paris that Russia should not take part in the conflict. The English and Italian sections had authority to do all that they could at London and Rome to support this pacific action.

When the war broke out the socialists were staggered. They were nowhere numerically strong enough to prevent it. The duty of the French and Belgian socialists was clear. Their countries had been invaded; the existence of their peoples was jeopardized, and they rushed to the defense of their countries as brave men were expected to do. In defending France the French socialist defended not only his own country but the cradle of civilization for Europe. There was no dissension among the French socialists, no difference of opinion. By all the precepts of the highest patriotism and of international socialism they were bound to give unstinted aid to protect France.

In Germany, in which the Government had been preparing for years for the contingency of a European war and where the ruling class, guided solely by strategic military considerations selected the most favorable moment for the conflict, the socialists found themselves in an impossible position. In 24 hours the Government could have crushed every socialist organization in the country. But that was not all. While republican France and innocent little Belgium were to the west of them, what was then considered a powerful military force—Russia—threatened Germany from the east. The war was on. The question that presented itself to the socialists was whether they should vote for the military budget. The individual socialist was already in the ranks, a part of a military machine. The parliamentary group, consisting of 110 members out of 397, were divided on the question of voting military credits. By a caucus rule they decided to vote for the war budget. The chairman of the Socialist Executive Committee of Germany, Haase, was in the minority in the caucus. Since then the best intellectual forces of the German social democracy have refused to vote military credits and have fearlessly denounced the imperialistic policies of the Government. What was in the beginning of the war a minority seems to represent now a formidable power in the socialist movement of Germany.

It was Haase who mercifully flayed the Government for the so-called Russian peace and who exposed the annexationist designs of the German Government.

The Socialists of the world, who for more than 50 years advocated international cooperation, were compelled by the very force of events to defend their respective countries.

They have not, however, abandoned the desire to tie together the severed bonds of internationalism.

The average conception of patriotism is that a man must always insist that his country is right, and as the Austrian Socialist Adler recently said on the floor of the Reichsrath it seems to be "considered a patriotic duty to lie for the Fatherland."

It was a difficult task that devolved upon the Socialists. No one can afford to weaken his country when its very existence may depend upon the success or defeat of its arms. To oppose the country entering a war is one thing; to oppose the country after it has been put in danger by entering a war is a responsibility that no one can honestly assume. The German Government has been contending that Germany is in danger of being dismembered, that it is threatened with annihilation, that it is fighting a war of defense.

The test of its sincerity came with the Russian revolution. An incompetent, inefficient, dishonest, antinational and anti-social autocratic Government was overthrown by the Russian people. The Revolutionary Government renounced all claims upon the territory of other nations. Although access to Constantinople was a vital need for Russia, and the dream of her statesmen for centuries, the new democracy did not hesitate to bring conclusive evidence of its good faith by repudiating all designs upon Constantinople. An internal revolution in war time does not add to the strength of a belligerent. Even the allies of Russia failed to understand the import of the revolution. The Socialists saw the full significance of it, and a movement for an international Socialist congress, which would have enabled the Socialists of the allied countries to put to the test the internationalism of the German social democracy, gained momentum.

Unfortunately the allied Governments prevented the assembling of such a congress. As I said on a previous occasion, "It was a blunder for which the full price has not yet been paid."

But while the allies blundered and the Socialists were prevented from coming together, the Imperial German Government took full advantage of the confusion and helplessness of the Russian people who were in the throes of war and revolution.

The German Government has now assumed the part heretofore played by czarism. Theretofore Russia was the gendarme of Europe; now the German imperialistic Government has become the executioner of Europe.

It has forced a so-called peace upon Russia. It has deprived her of her best Provinces. It has torn away from her Ukraine, the granary of Russia and Europe. It is to the credit of the German Socialists that they did not vote for the ratification of that infamous treaty.

The German Government is defying the world. Its only hope of survival is the old-fashioned kind of patriotism which sanctions every crime against every other nation, so long as one's own nation is aggrandized. The German Imperial Government hopes to continue to live, if it can bring as a compensation for all the sacrifices and as a result of all its crimes new territory, new frontiers, additional industrial opportunities, new domains.

Like the Government of the Czar, it is antisocial, antinational, and against the world.

Will the socialists of Germany be able to gather enough strength to overcome that kind of loyalty and that kind of patriotism? Are they prepared to uphold their Government in a career which will make the division of the world into Germans and anti-Germans permanent?

The Interallied Socialist Conference, held in London, England, in February of this year, has renewed the request for an international socialist congress. The allied Socialists are determined, however, that a conference of all the socialists, including those of the central powers, would be of value only then, when all the organizations which are to be represented should pledge themselves in advance of the conference to the principle "no annexations, no punitive indemnities, and the right of all peoples to self-determination," and further, to quote the inter-allied conference report, "that they are working with all their power to obtain from their Governments the necessary guaranties to apply these principles honestly and unreservedly to all questions to be dealt with at any official peace conference."

It is to be hoped that the Governments responsible for the conduct of the war will see the wisdom of permitting such an international conference.

On a previous occasion I obtained leave to incorporate in the RECORD the memorandum on war aims agreed upon at the Interallied Socialist Congress. There were present at the conference representatives from England, Belgium, Roumania, France, Italy, Serbia, and Greece. Messages were received from the socialists of South Africa, Portugal, the socialist revolutionists of Russia, and the Menshevik section of the Russian Social Democratic Party indorsing the war aims of the conference, the substance of which had been made public two months before.

I consider this document one of the most valuable documents in the history of the war. The worker, the man at the lowest rung of the social ladder, he upon whom press all the burdens of society, has asserted himself and has voiced his wishes

and his claims as an international force, speaking in terms of the universal, representative of a true international faith, defending his country against aggression but presenting to the world a basis of an understanding and cooperation among nations.

I am particularly interested in giving this document the greatest publicity, as it is my hope that the socialist movement in the United States will unanimously indorse and stand by the decision of the Inter-Allied Socialist Congress. As socialists, whatever our opinions might have been about the entry of the United States into the war, we certainly can not afford to see the United States worsted in the contest. The socialist is not called upon to betray his faith in international socialism nor in the necessity of substituting the now prevailing rule of physical force by an international code of right.

It is not that the allied countries are without their dark forces. There are imperialists everywhere. There are everywhere men who would wrap up their sinister designs in the folds of a national flag and would have whole peoples sacrificed in pursuance of schemes of economic aggrandizement.

These facts, however, are clear: An arrogant and willful military force threatens to crush the world. Had we not been participants in the war both our sympathies and interests as liberty-loving men would have been with France and Belgium and England and unfortunate Russia, as against German imperialism. But the United States is in the war. Whatever the designs or the dreams of capitalistic imperialists may be, the President of the United States has left no doubt that the American people, and he as their spokesman, have no selfish designs. The President has not only adopted the substance of the international Socialist program, but even the very formula of the international Socialist movement for his expression of the aims and objects of the United States in this war.

The Socialists in the United States can not be indifferent or neutral. There is surely no Socialist here who would like to see the United States defeated. In the absence of selfish national designs by the United States against any of the peoples of Europe American participation of the United States in the world contest will insure the presence of an element of moderation at the international peace conference.

The declaration of the Inter-Allied Socialist conference rises to the noblest heights of Socialist ethics. It is free from malice and hatred. There is no jingoism about it. The philosophy of the international Socialist movement which has been striving for more than half a century to curb imperialism, to eliminate national antipathies, to do away with clandestine diplomacy, with secret treaties, to remove force as a means of settling national differences, and to bring order into the relations of peoples, finds there its noblest expression.

The work of the conference is inspired, not by a desire to restore the old, which carried within it the germs of the present conflict, but to build anew.

The war aims of interallied labor lay special stress on the need of establishing a league of nations for the defense of international right. They would do away with professional armies. They emphatically oppose all projects for an economic war after peace has been secured.

They propose a comprehensive, constructive program for the solution of the problems which will arise with peace. They would provide for the restoration of the devastated areas and for the reparation of the wrongdoing not only by restoring "material property proved to be destroyed or damaged but by setting up the wage earners and peasants themselves in homes and employments."

While proposing solutions for the particular problems of (a) Belgium, (b) Alsace-Lorraine, (c) the Balkans, (d) Italy, (e) Poland and the Baltic Provinces, (f) the Jews and Palestine, (g) the Turkish Empire, (h) Austria-Hungary, (i) the colonies and dependencies, the main concern of the conference is that a supernatural authority, guided by international principles of right, shall be the determining factor in solving each individual problem as it presents itself.

Under leave heretofore granted to me I incorporate the full text of the "Memorandum on War Aims."

INTER-ALLIED LABOR WAR AIMS.

The following is the full text of the Memorandum on War Aims adopted by the Inter-Allied Labor and Socialist Conference in London:

THE WAR.

I. The Inter-Allied Conference declares that whatever may have been the causes of the outbreak of war, it is clear that the peoples of Europe, who are necessarily the chief sufferers from its horrors, had themselves no hand in it. Their common interest is now so to conduct the terrible struggle in which they find themselves engaged as to bring it, as soon as may be possible, to an issue in a secure and lasting peace for the world.

The conference sees no reason to depart from the following declaration unanimously agreed to at the Conference of the Socialist and Labor Parties of the Allied Nations on February 14, 1915:

"This conference can not ignore the profound general causes of the European conflict, itself a monstrous product of the antagonisms which tear asunder capitalist society and of the policy of colonial dependencies and aggressive imperialism, against which international socialism has never ceased to fight, and in which every government has its share of responsibility.

"The invasion of Belgium and France by the German armies threatens the very existence of independent nationalities and strikes a blow at all faith in treaties. In these circumstances a victory for German imperialism would be the defeat and the destruction of democracy and liberty in Europe. The Socialists of Great Britain, Belgium, France, and Russia do not pursue the political and economic crushing of Germany; they are not at war with the peoples of Germany and Austria, but only with the Governments of those countries, by which they are oppressed. They demand that Belgium shall be liberated and compensated. They desire that the question of Poland shall be settled in accordance with the wishes of the Polish people, either in the sense of autonomy in the midst of another State, or in that of complete independence. They wish that throughout all Europe, from Alsace-Lorraine to the Balkans, those populations that have been annexed by force shall receive the right freely to dispose of themselves.

"While inflexibly resolved to fight until victory is achieved to accomplish this task of liberation, the socialists are none the less resolved to resist any attempt to transform this defensive war into a war of conquest, which would only prepare fresh conflicts, create new grievances, and subject various peoples more than ever to the double plague of armaments and war.

"Satisfied that they are remaining true to the principles of the international, the members of the conference express the hope that the working classes of all the different countries will before long find themselves united again in their struggle against militarism and capitalist imperialism. The victory of the allied powers must be a victory for popular liberty, for unity, independence, and autonomy of the nations in the peaceful federation of the united States of Europe and the world."

MAKING THE WORLD SAFE FOR DEMOCRACY.

II. Whatever may have been the objects for which the war was begun, the fundamental purpose of the interallied conference in supporting the continuance of the struggle is that the world may henceforth be made safe for democracy.

Of all the conditions of peace none is so important to the peoples of the world as that there should be henceforth on earth no more war.

Whoever triumphs, the peoples will have lost unless an international system is established which will prevent war. What would it mean to declare the right of peoples to self-determination if this right were left at the mercy of new violations and was not protected by a super-national authority? That authority can be no other than the league of nations, in which not only all the present belligerents but every other independent State should be pressed to join.

The constitution of such a league of nations implies the immediate establishment of an international high court, not only for the settlement of all disputes between States that are of justiciable nature but also for prompt and effective mediation between States in other issues that vitally interest the power or honor of such States. It is also under the control of the league of nations that the consultation of peoples for purposes of self-determination must be organized. This popular right can be vindicated only by popular vote. The league of nations shall establish the procedure of international jurisdiction, fix the methods which will maintain the freedom and security of the election, restore the political rights of individuals which violence and conquest may have injured, repress any attempt to use pressure or corruption, and prevent any subsequent reprisals. It will be also necessary to form an international legislature, in which the representatives of every civilized State would have their allotted share and energetically to push forward, step by step, the development of international legislation agreed to by, and definitely binding upon, the several States.

By a solemn agreement all the States and peoples consulted shall pledge themselves to submit every issue between two or more of them for settlement as aforesaid. Refusal to accept arbitration or to submit to the settlement will imply deliberate aggression, and all the nations will necessarily have to make common cause, by using any and every means at their disposal, either economical or military, against any State or States refusing to submit to the arbitration award, or attempting to break the world's covenant of peace.

But the sincere acceptance of the rules and decisions of the super-national authority implies complete democratization in all countries; the removal of all the arbitrary powers who, until now, have assumed the right of choosing between peace and war; the maintenance or creation of legislatures elected by and on behalf of the sovereign right of the people; the suppression of secret diplomacy, to be replaced by the conduct of foreign policy under the control of popular legislatures, and the publication of all treaties, which must never be in contravention of the stipulation of the league of nations, with the absolute responsibility of the Government, and more particularly of the foreign minister, of each country to its legislature.

Only such a policy will enforce the frank abandonment of every form of imperialism. When based on universal democracy, in a world in which effective international guaranties against aggression have been secured, the league of nations will achieve the complete suppression of force as the means of settling international differences.

The league of nations, in order to prepare for the concerted abolition of compulsory military service in all countries, must first take steps for the prohibition of fresh armaments on land and sea and for the common limitation of the existing armaments by which all the peoples are burdened, as well as the control of war manufactures and the enforcement of such agreements as may be agreed to thereupon. The States must undertake such manufactures themselves, so as entirely to abolish profit-making armament firms, whose pecuniary interest lies always in the war scares and progressive competition in the preparation for war.

The nations, being armed solely for self-defense and for such action as the league of nations may ask them to take in defense of international right, will be left free, under international control either to create a voluntarily recruited force or to organize the nation for defense without professional armies for long terms of military service.

To give effect to the above principles, the Inter-Allied Conference declares that the rules upon which the league of nations will be founded must be included in the treaty of peace, and will henceforth become the basis of the settlement of differences. In that spirit the conference expresses its agreement with the propositions put forward by President Wilson in his last message:

(1) That each part of the final settlement must be based upon the essential justice of that particular case, and upon such adjustments as are most likely to bring a peace that will be permanent.

(2) That peoples and provinces are not to be bartered about from sovereignty to sovereignty as if they were mere chattels and pawns in a game, even the great game now forever discredited of the balance of power; but that

(3) Every territorial settlement involved in this war must be made in the interest and for the benefit of the populations concerned, and not as a part of any mere adjustments of compromise of claims amongst rival States.

(4) That all well-defined national aspirations shall be accorded the utmost satisfaction that can be accorded them without introducing new or perpetuating old elements of discord and antagonism that would be likely in time to break the peace of Europe, and, consequently, of the world.

TERRITORIAL QUESTIONS.

III. The Inter-Allied Conference considers that the proclamation of principles of international law accepted by all nations, and the substitution of a regular procedure for the forceful acts by which States calling themselves sovereign have hitherto adjusted their differences—in short, the establishment of a league of nations—gives an entirely new aspect to territorial problems.

The old diplomacy and the yearnings after domination by States, or even by peoples, which during the whole of the nineteenth century have taken advantage of and corrupted the aspirations of nationalities, have brought Europe to a condition of anarchy and disorder which have led inevitably to the present catastrophe.

The conference declares it to be the duty of the labor and socialist movement to suppress without hesitation the imperialist designs in the various States which have led one government after another to seek, by the triumph of military force, to acquire either new territories or economic advantage.

The establishment of a system of international law and the guaranties afforded by a league of nations ought to remove the last excuse for those strategic protections which nations have hitherto felt bound to require.

It is the supreme principle of the right of each people to determine its own destiny that must now decide what steps should be taken by way of restitution or reparation, and whatever territorial readjustments may be found to be necessary at the close of the present war.

The conference accordingly emphasizes the importance to the labor and Socialist movement of a clear and exact definition of what is meant by the right of each people to determine its own destiny. Neither destiny of race nor identity of language can be regarded as affording more than a presumption in favor of federation or unification. During the nineteenth century the theories of this kind have so often served as a cloak for aggression that the international can not but seek to prevent any recurrence of such an evil. Any adjustments of boundaries that become necessary must be based exclusively upon the desire of the people concerned.

It is true that it is impossible for the necessary consultation of the desires of the people concerned to be made in any fixed and invariable way for all the cases in which it is required, and that the problems of nationality and territory are not the same for the inhabitants of all countries. Nevertheless, what is necessary in all cases is that the procedure to be adopted should be decided, not by one of the parties to the dispute, but by the super-national authority.

Upon the basis of the general principles herein formulated the conference proposes the following solutions of particular problems:

(A) BELGIUM.

The conference emphatically insists that a foremost condition of peace must be the reparation by the German Government, under the direction of an international commission, of the wrong admittedly done to Belgium; payment by that Government for all the damage that has resulted from this wrong; and the restoration of Belgium as an independent sovereign State, leaving to the decision of the Belgian people the determination of their own future policy in all respects.

(B) ALSACE AND LORRAINE.

The conference declares that the problem of Alsace and Lorraine is not one of territorial adjustment, but one of right, and thus an international problem, the solution of which is indispensable if peace is to be either just or lasting.

The treaty of Frankfurt at one and the same time mutilated France and violated the right of the inhabitants of Alsace and Lorraine to dispose of their own destinies, a right which they have repeatedly claimed.

The new treaty of peace, in recognizing that Germany, by her declaration of war of 1914, has herself broken the treaty of Frankfurt, will make null and void the gains of a brutal conquest and of the violence committed against the people.

France, having secured this recognition, can properly agree to a fresh consultation of the population of Alsace and Lorraine as to its own desires.

The treaty of peace will bear the signatures of every nation in the world. It will be guaranteed by the league of nations. To this league of nations France is prepared to remit, with the freedom and sincerity of a popular vote, of which the details can be subsequently settled, the organization of such a consultation as shall settle forever, as a matter of right, the future destiny of Alsace and Lorraine, and as shall finally remove from the common life of all Europe a quarrel which has imposed so heavy a burden upon it.

(C) THE BALKANS.

The conference lays down the principle that all the violations and perversions of the rights of the people which have taken place, or are still taking place, in the Balkans must be made the subject of redress or reparation.

Serbia, Montenegro, Roumania, Albania, and all the territories occupied by military forces should be evacuated by the hostile forces. Wherever any population of the same race and tongue demands to be united this must be done. Each such people must be accorded full liberty to settle its own destiny, without regard to the imperialistic pretensions of Austria, Hungary, Turkey, or other State.

Accepting this principle, the conference proposes that the whole problem of the administrative reorganization of the Balkan peoples should be dealt with by a special conference of their representatives, or in case of disagreement by an authoritative international commission on the basis of (a) the concession within each independent sovereignty of local autonomy and security for the development of its particular civilization of every racial minority; (b) the universal guarantee of freedom of religion and political equality for all races; (c) a customs and postal union embracing the whole of the Balkan States, with free access for each to its natural seaport; (d) the entry of all the Balkan States into a federation for the concerted arrangement by mutual agreement among themselves of all matters of common interest.

(D) ITALY.

The conference declares its warmest sympathy with the people of Italian blood and speech who have been left outside the boundaries that have, as a result of the diplomatic agreements of the past, and for strategic reasons, been assigned to the Kingdom of Italy, and supports their claim to be united with those of their own race and tongue. It realizes that arrangements may be necessary for securing the legitimate interests of the people of Italy in the adjacent seas, but it condemns the aims of conquest of Italian imperialism and believes that all legitimate needs can be safeguarded without precluding a like recognition of the deeds of others or annexation of other people's territories.

Regarding the Italian population dispersed on the eastern shores of the Adriatic, the relations between Italy and the Yugo-Slav populations must be based on principles of equity and conciliation, so as to prevent any cause of future quarrel.

It there are found to be groups of Slavonian race within the newly defined Kingdom of Italy, or groups of Italian race in Slavonian territory, mutual guarantees must be given for the assurance of all of them, on one side or the other, full liberty of local self-government and of the natural development of their several activities.

(E) POLAND AND THE BALTIC PROVINCES.

In accordance with the right of every people to determine its own destinies, Poland must be reconstituted in unity and independence with free access to the sea.

The conference declares further, that any annexation by Germany, whether open or disguised, of Livonia, Courland, or Lithuania would be a flagrant and wholly inadmissible violation of international law.

(F) THE JEWS AND PALESTINE.

The conference demands for the Jews in all countries the same elementary rights of freedom of religion, education, residence, and trade, and equal citizenship that ought to be extended to all the inhabitants of every nation. It further expresses the opinion that Palestine should be set free from the hard and oppressive Government of the Turk, in order that this country may form a free State under international guaranty, to which such of the Jewish people as desire to do so may return and may work out their own salvation free from interference by those of alien race or religion.

(G) THE PROBLEM OF THE TURKISH EMPIRE.

The conference condemns the handing back to the systematically cruel domination of the Turkish Government any subject people. Thus, whatever may be proposed with regard to Armenia, Mesopotamia, and Arabia they can not be restored to the tyranny of the Sultan and his Pashas. The conference condemns the imperialist aims of governments and capitalists who would make of these and other territories now dominated by the Turkish hordes merely instruments either of exploitation or militarism. If the peoples of these territories do not feel themselves able to settle their own destinies, the conference insists that, conformably with policy of "no annexations," they should be placed for administration in the hands of a commission acting under the supranational authority or league of nations. It is further suggested that the peace of the world requires that the Dardanelles should be permanently and effectively neutralized and opened like all the main lines of marine communication, under the control of the league of nations, freely to all nations, without hindrance or customs duties.

(H) AUSTRIA-HUNGARY.

The conference does not propose, as a war aim, dismemberment of Austria-Hungary or its deprivation of economic access to the sea. On the other hand, the conference can not admit that the claims to independence made by the Czecho-Slovaks and the Yugo-Slavs must be regarded merely as questions for internal decision. National independence ought to be accorded, according to rules to be laid down by the league of nations, to such peoples as demand it, and these communities ought to have the opportunity of determining their own groupings and federations according to their affinities and interests. If they think fit they are free to substitute a free federation of Danubian States for the Austro-Hungarian Empire.

(I) THE COLONIES AND DEPENDENCIES.

The international has always condemned the colonial policy of capitalist governments. Without ceasing to condemn it, the interallied conference nevertheless recognizes the existence of a state of things which it is obliged to take into account.

The conference considers that the treaty of peace ought to secure to the natives in all colonies and dependencies effective protection against the excesses of capitalist colonialism. The conference demands the concession of administrative autonomy for all groups of people that attain a certain degree of civilization, and for all the others a progressive participation in local government.

The conference is of opinion that the return of the colonies to those who possessed them before the war, or the exchange or compensations which might be effected, ought not to be an obstacle to the making of peace.

Those colonies that have been taken by conquest from any belligerent must be made the subject of special consideration at the peace conference, as to which the communities in their neighborhood will be entitled to take part. But the clause in the treaty of peace on this point must secure economic equality in such territories for the peoples of all nations, and thereby guarantee that none are shut out from legitimate access to raw materials; prevented from disposing of their own products, or deprived of their proper share of economic development.

As regards more especially the colonies of all the belligerents in tropical Africa, from sea to sea, including the whole of the region north of the Zambesi and south of the Sahara, the conference condemns any imperialist idea which would make these countries the booty of one or several nations, exploit them for the profit of the capitalist, or use them for the promotion of the militarist aims of the Governments.

With respect to these colonies the conference declares in favor of a system of control, established by international agreement, under the League of Nations and maintained by its guarantee, which, whilst respecting national sovereignty, would be alike inspired by broad conceptions of economic freedom and concerned to safeguard the rights of the natives under the best conditions possible for them, and in particular:

(1) It would take account in each locality of the wishes of the people, expressed in the form which is possible for them.

(2) The interests of the native tribes as regards the ownership of the soil would be maintained.

(3) The whole of the revenues would be devoted to the well-being and development of the colonies themselves.

ECONOMIC RELATIONS.

IV. The interallied conference declares against all the projects now being prepared by imperialists and capitalists, not in any one country only but in most countries, for an economic war, after peace has been secured, either against one or other foreign nation or against all foreign nations, as such an economic war, if begun by any country, would inevitably lead to reprisals, to which each nation in turn might in self-defense be driven. The main lines of marine communication should be open without hindrance to vessels of all nations under the protection of the League of Nations. The conference realizes that all attempts at economic aggression, whether by protective tariffs or capitalist trusts or monopolies, inevitably result in the spoliation of the working classes of the several countries for the profit of the capitalists; and the working class see in the alliance between the military imperialists and the fiscal protectionists in any country whatsoever not only a serious danger to the prosperity of the masses of the people but also a grave menace to peace.

On the other hand, the right of each nation to the defense of its own economic interests, and in face of the world shortage hereinafter mentioned, to the conservation for its own people of a sufficiency of its own supplies of foodstuffs and raw materials, can not be denied. The conference accordingly urges upon the labor and socialist parties of all countries the importance of insisting, in the attitude of the Government toward commercial enterprise, along with the necessary control of supplies for its own people, on the principle of the open door, and without hostile discrimination against foreign countries. But it urges equally the importance not merely of conservation, but also of the utmost possible development, by appropriate Government action, of the resources of every country for the benefit not only of its own people, but also of the world, and the need for an international agreement for the enforcement in all countries of the legislation on factory conditions, a maximum eight-hour day, the prevention of "sweating," and unhealthy trades necessary to protect the workers against exploitation and oppression, and the prohibition of night work by women and children.

THE PROBLEMS OF PEACE.

V. To make the world safe for democracy involves much more than the prevention of war, either military or economic. It will be a device of the capitalist interests to pretend that the treaty of peace need concern itself only with the cessation of the struggles of the armed forces and with any necessary territorial readjustments. The interallied Conference insists that in view of the probable world-wide shortage after the war of exportable foodstuffs and raw materials, and of merchant shipping, it is imperative, in order to prevent the most serious hardships, and even possible famine, in one country or another, that systematic arrangements should be made on an international basis for the allocation and conveyance of the available exportable surpluses of these commodities to the different countries, in proportion, not to their purchasing powers, but to their several pressing needs; and that, within each country, the Government must for some time maintain its control of the most indispensable commodities in order to secure their appropriation, not in a competitive market mainly to the richer classes in proportion to their means, but, systematically, to meet the most urgent needs of the whole community on the principle of "no cake for anyone until all have bread."

Moreover, it can not but be anticipated that in all countries the dislocation of industry attendant on peace, the instant discharge of millions of munition makers and workers in war trades, and the demobilization of millions of soldiers—in face of the scarcity of industrial capital, the shortage of raw materials, and the insecurity of commercial enterprise—will, unless prompt and energetic action be taken by the several Governments, plunge a large part of the wage-earning population into all the miseries of unemployment more or less prolonged.

In view of the fact that widespread unemployment in any country, like a famine, is an injury not to that country alone but impoverishes also the rest of the world, the conference holds that it is the duty of every government to take immediate action, not merely to relieve the unemployed, when unemployment has set in, but actually, so far as may be practicable, to prevent the occurrence of unemployment. It therefore urges upon the labor parties of every country the necessity of their pressing upon their governments the preparation of plans for the execution of all the innumerable public works (such as the making and repairing of roads, railways and waterways, the erection of schools and public buildings, the provision of working-class dwellings and the reclamation and afforestation of land) that will be required in the near future, not for the sake of finding measures of relief for the unemployed but with a view to these works being undertaken at such a rate in each locality as will suffice, together with the various capitalist enterprises that may be in progress, to maintain at a fairly uniform level year by year, and throughout each year, the aggregate demand for labor, and thus prevent there being any unemployed. It is now known that in this way it is quite possible for any government to prevent, if it chooses, the occurrence of any widespread or prolonged involuntary unemployment, which if it is now in any country allowed to occur is as much the result of government neglect as is any epidemic disease.

RESTORATION OF THE DEVASTATED AREAS AND REPARATION OF WRONGDOING.

VI. The interallied Conference holds that one of the most imperative duties of all countries immediately peace is declared will be the restoration, so far as may be possible, of the homes, farms, factories, public buildings, and means of communication whatever destroyed by war operations; that the restoration should not be limited to compensation for public buildings, capitalist undertakings, and material property proved to be destroyed or damaged, but should be extended to setting up the wage earners and peasants themselves in homes and employment; and that to insure the full and impartial application of these principles the assessment and distribution of the compensation, so far as the cost is contributed by any international fund, should be made under the direction of an international commission.

The conference will not be satisfied unless there is a full and free judicial investigation into the accusations made on all sides that particular governments have ordered and particular officers have exercised acts of cruelty, oppression, violence, and theft against individual victims, for which no justification can be found in the ordinary usages of war. It draws attention in particular to the loss of life and property of merchant seamen and other noncombatants (including women and children) resulting from this inhuman and ruthless conduct. It should be part of the conditions of peace that there should be forthwith set up a court of claims and accusations, which should investigate all such allegations as may be brought before it, summon the accused person or government to answer the complaint, to pronounce

judgment, and award compensation or damages, payable by the individual or government condemned to the persons who had suffered wrong or to their dependents. The several governments must be responsible, financially and otherwise, for the presentation of the cases of their respective nationals to such a court of claims and accusations and for the payment of the compensation awarded.

INTERNATIONAL CONFERENCE.

VII. The Interallied Conference is of opinion that an international conference of labor and socialist organizations, held under proper conditions, would at this stage render useful service to world democracy by assisting to remove misunderstandings, as well as the obstacles which stand in the way of world peace.

Awaiting the resumption of the normal activities of the International Socialist Bureau, we consider that an international conference held during the period of hostilities should be organized by a committee whose impartiality can not be questioned. It should be held in a neutral country, under such conditions as would inspire confidence, and the conference should be fully representative of all the labor and socialist movements in all the belligerent countries accepting the conditions under which the conference is convoked.

As an essential condition to an international conference the commission is of opinion that the organizers of the conference should satisfy themselves that all the organizations to be represented put in precise form, by a public declaration, their peace terms in conformity with the principles, "no annexations or punitive indemnities, and the right of all peoples to self-determination," and that they are working with all their power to obtain from their governments the necessary guarantees to apply those principles honestly and unreservedly to all questions to be dealt with at any official peace conference.

In view of the vital differences between the allied countries and the central powers, the commission is of opinion that it is highly advisable that the conference should be used to provide an opportunity for the delegates from the respective countries now in a state of war to make a full and frank statement of their present position and future intentions, and to endeavor by mutual agreement to arrange a program of action for a speedy and democratic peace.

The conference is of opinion that the working classes, having made such sacrifices during the war, are entitled to take part in securing a democratic world peace, and that M. Albert Thomas (France), M. Emile Vandervelde (Belgium), and Mr. Arthur Henderson (Great Britain) be appointed as a commission to secure from all the Governments a promise that at least one representative of labor and socialism will be included in the official representation at any Government conference, and to organize a labor and socialist representation to sit concurrently with the official conference; further, that no country be entitled to more than four representatives at such conference.

The conference regrets the absence of representatives of American labor and socialism from the Interallied Conference, and urges the importance of securing their approval of the decisions reached. With this object in view, the conference agrees that a deputation, consisting of one representative from France, Belgium, Italy, and Great Britain, together with Camille Huysmans (secretary of the International Socialist Bureau), proceed to the United States at once, in order to confer with representatives of the American democracy on the whole situation of the war.

The conference resolves to transmit to the socialists of the central empires and of the nations allied with them the memorandum in which the conference has defined the conditions of peace, conformably with the principles of socialist and international justice. The conference is convinced that these conditions will commend themselves on reflection to the mind of every socialist, and the conference asks for the answer of the socialists of the central empires, in the hope that these will join without delay in a joint effort of the international, which has now become more than ever the best and the most certain instrument of democracy and peace.

The CHAIRMAN. The time of the gentleman from New York has again expired.

Mr. DAVIS. Mr. Chairman, there are several gentlemen from our larger States who have requested time to-day—four of them, I believe—and I have been looking for them for the last half hour, and I can not find any of them. Hence, so far as I am concerned, if the chairman so desires, the Clerk can begin the reading of the bill.

Mr. GILLET. I think it fair to suggest that it was not expected to-day that the bill would be taken up. It was supposed that it would be taken up to-morrow, to-day being Calendar Wednesday.

Mr. DAVIS. I indorse what the gentleman has stated.

Mr. WALSH. I assume, if the debate is to proceed under the five-minute rule, that the gentleman should have a quorum here.

Mr. Sisson. We would like to read only a few sections in the fore part of the bill.

The CHAIRMAN. Without objection, the Clerk will read.

The Clerk read as follows:

Be it enacted, etc., That one half of the following sums, respectively, is appropriated, out of any money in the Treasury not otherwise appropriated, and the other half out of the revenues of the District of Columbia, in full for the following expenses of the government of the District of Columbia for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1919, namely:

Mr. GARD. Mr. Chairman, I offer the following amendment.

The CHAIRMAN. The gentleman from Ohio offers an amendment, which the Clerk will report.

The Clerk read as follows:

Amendment offered by Mr. GARD: Page 1, strike out all the words in line 3, beginning with the word "that," and all the words in line 4, and all the words in line 5, and the words "District of Columbia" in line 6, and insert in lieu thereof the following:

"The following sums are appropriated out of the revenues of the District of Columbia to the extent that they are sufficient therefor, and the remainder out of any money in the Treasury not otherwise appropriated; but the amount to be paid from the Treasury of the United States shall in no event be as much as one-half of said expenses, in

full for the following expenses for the government of the District of Columbia for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1919, except amounts to pay the interest and sinking fund on the funded debt of said district, of which amounts one half is appropriated out of the money in the Treasury not otherwise appropriated and the other half out of the revenues of the District of Columbia."

Mr. Sisson. Mr. Chairman, I make a point of order on the amendment.

The CHAIRMAN. What is the point of order?

Mr. Sisson. That it changes existing law. The present law regulating the District of Columbia provides that half the expenses of the District of Columbia shall be paid out of the District treasury and the other half out of the Federal Treasury. This amendment changes existing law.

The CHAIRMAN. Does the gentleman from Ohio [Mr. GARD] desire to be heard on the amendment?

Mr. GARD. The amendment is one which comes within the purview of the so-called Holman rule, as evidenced by a ruling of the same Chairman who occupied the chair when a similar amendment was presented in 1915, the exception being as to that part of the amendment which makes it germane where the appropriation to be made by the amendment is less than that carried in the original bill. This amendment so provides, and is practically the same amendment which this Chairman, sitting as the Chairman of the Committee of the Whole in 1915, determined to be a proper amendment, and is, I now submit, in every way a proper amendment to the bill.

The CHAIRMAN. Does the gentleman from Mississippi desire to be heard on the point of order?

Mr. Sisson. Mr. Chairman, I looked at the amendment for the purpose of ascertaining whether or not it was the identical amendment presented to the Chair two years ago. I think it was.

Mr. GARD. Yes.

Mr. Sisson. I do not have the other amendment before me. I believe the first portion of the amendment to be identical with the amendment which was ruled upon by the Chair once before. I am not sure whether or not the latter clause in that amendment was passed upon by the Chair at that time, unless the gentleman from Ohio can state that it is the identical amendment.

Mr. GARD. It is the identical amendment, I will say to the Chair.

The CHAIRMAN. The Chair has a recollection about that amendment, and if his memory serves him correctly it was very elaborately argued at that time, and the precedents were looked up, after which the point of order was overruled. Following that precedent, the Chair overrules the point of order. The question is on the amendment offered by the gentleman from Ohio.

Mr. GARD. Upon that point, Mr. Chairman, I would suggest the absence of a quorum.

The CHAIRMAN. The gentleman from Ohio makes the point of order that there is no quorum present. Evidently there is not. The Clerk will call the roll.

The Clerk called the roll, when the following Members failed to answer to their names:

Anderson	Dominick	Heintz	Morin
Anthony	Donovan	Hensley	Mott
Austin	Dooling	Hicks	Mudd
Barnhart	Doremus	Hood	Neely
Blackmon	Doughton	Houston	Nichols, Mich.
Borland	Drukker	Howard	Norton
Britten	Dunn	Hull, Iowa	Oldfield
Brodbeck	Dupré	Humphreys	Olney
Browning	Eagan	Hutchinson	O'Shaunnessy
Butler	Edmonds	Jacaway	Overstreet
Cannon	Elliot	Johnson, S. Dak.	Padgett
Cantrill	Elston	Johnson, Wash.	Peters
Caraway	Estopinal	Jones	Phelan
Carew	Fairchild, B. L.	Kahn	Polk
Carlin	Fairfield	Kelley, Mich.	Porter
Carter, Mass.	Farr	Kennedy, R. I.	Powers
Clark, Fla.	Fess	Kettner	Pratt
Clark, Pa.	Fields	Key, Ohio	Price
Coady	Fisher	King	Purnell
Connelly, Kans.	Flynn	Kreider	Ragsdale
Cooper, Ohio	Fordney	LaGuardia	Rainey, H. T.
Cooper, W. Va.	Foss	Lee, Ga.	Ramsey
Copley	Gallagher	Leibach	Randall
Costello	Garland	Lever	Reavis
Cox	Garrett, Tex.	Littlepage	Robbins
Crago	Glass	McArthur	Roberts
Cramton	Godwin, N. C.	McCormick	Rodenberg
Crosser	Gordon	McCulloch	Rose
Curry, Cal.	Gray, Ala.	McFadden	Rouse
Dale, Vt.	Gray, N. J.	McLemore	Rowland
Davidson	Gregg	Madden	Sanders, La.
Denison	Griest	Maher	Saunders, Va.
Dent	Griffin	Mann	Schall
Denton	Hamill	Meeker	Scott, Pa.
Dewalt	Hamilton, N. Y.	Miller, Minn.	Scully
Dickinson	Haskell	Mondell	Sears
Dies	Hawley	Montague	Sherley
Dill	Heaton	Moore, Ind.	Shouse

Slomp	Steele	Templeton	Waldow
Sloan	Stephens, Nebr.	Thompson	Walker
Small	Sterling, Pa.	Tinkham	Ward
Smith, Idaho	Sullivan	Towner	Weaver
Smith, Mich.	Sumners	Vare	White, Mo.
Smith, C. B.	Swift	Verable	Wilson, Tex.
Smith, T. F.	Talbott	Vestal	Winslow
Stafford	Taylor, Colo.	Vinson	

The committee rose; and the Speaker having resumed the chair, Mr. GARNER, Chairman of the Committee of the Whole House on the state of the Union, reported that that committee having under consideration the District of Columbia appropriation bill, finding itself without a quorum, had caused the roll to be called and 247 Members had answered to their names, and he reported a list of the absentees.

The committee resumed its session.

Mr. GARD. Mr. Chairman, the purpose of the amendment offered by me is to carry into effect not alone two previous actions of this House, but also the unanimous action of a special commission, consisting of three United States Senators and three Members of the House of Representatives, who have made a finding, which finding is the same as that embodied in the amendment I have offered. Its purpose is to stand by the authorization of the issue of the funded debt of the District of Columbia, and when it comes to the payment of municipal expenses, it takes away the fiction of the half and half.

The so-called half-and-half matter has been discussed in the House many times, and the House has twice voted to strike it out because it served no useful purpose. It is purely and entirely a fiction. It can not accomplish any good for the District of Columbia, and it can only work harm to the general taxpayers of the United States, who are called upon to contribute money entirely unnecessary. It had its origin at a time when the assistance of the Federal Government was necessary to take care of certain extraordinary expenditures of the District. But now the District of Columbia, of which the city of Washington is the greater part, has a very small indebtedness; in fact, the indebtedness is being paid for in yearly proportions of appropriation, and in 1924 there will be absolutely no indebtedness. The tax receipts of the District of Columbia have grown largely, and are now far in excess of the tax revenues of 1878.

The plan proposed in this amendment is the sensible plan, the only plan which the cities, towns, and counties in which we live adhere to. The plan is that the District of Columbia shall pay a fair tax; that the rate shall be assessed on an equitable valuation of the real and personal property, and that that sum of money should be applied to the payment of the expenses of the District; that the necessary balance shall be contributed by the Federal Government; no matter what it may be, it shall be contributed so that the District of Columbia will have a proper and substantial government, because this is the national city of the country and should be a model for the capital cities of the world.

To show the limits to which we have gone, Mr. Chairman, I call the attention of the committee to the financial statement of the auditor of the District of Columbia for the year 1918, in which he showed that there is at this time a cash balance to the credit of the District of Columbia in the Treasury of the United States of \$2,664,717.17, with another cash balance on account of the general fund, so that the Federal cash balances amount to \$2,693,509.89 less certain District obligations on account of its share of unadvanced appropriations amounting to \$1,313,290.99, leaving a resulting surplus of revenue from all appropriations and charges to and including June 30, 1916, as above stated, of \$1,380,218.90.

Mr. JOHNSON of Kentucky. Will the gentleman yield?

Mr. GARD. Yes.

Mr. JOHNSON of Kentucky. The clerk of the Appropriations Committee informs me that at the end of the fiscal year the District of Columbia will have on hand a balance of approximately \$5,000,000 for which it will have no use. In the meantime the United States Treasury is asked to contribute money to the municipal corporation, which has \$5,000,000 to its credit.

Mr. GARD. In the report which was made accompanying this bill it is stated that the estimated surplus of the District revenues will amount to \$1,482,301.67. These two amounts show, as the gentleman from Kentucky has well said, that in June, 1919, there will be approximately \$5,000,000 in the revenues of the District of Columbia unappropriated and for which there is absolutely no use. The report of the committee discloses a number of most unusual expenses—I mean expenses unusual to the ordinary government of a city—and yet after these usual and unusual expenses at the end of the fiscal year 1919 nearly \$5,000,000 will be in the treasury of the District of Columbia unappropriated, serving no useful purpose, and during all of

that time the people of the United States are being continually asked to raise money for governmental purposes.

The CHAIRMAN. The time of the gentleman from Ohio has expired.

Mr. GARD. Mr. Chairman, I ask unanimous consent to proceed for five minutes more.

The CHAIRMAN. Is there objection?

There was no objection.

Mr. GARD. There is no sound sense in any municipal taxation which piles up a great amount of money in a municipal treasury, unexpended, unused, unasked for, and unnecessary, and that is the situation which to-day confronts the people of the United States and the District of Columbia.

Mr. WALSH. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. GARD. Certainly.

Mr. WALSH. Can the gentleman state whether any committee of Congress or otherwise has ever investigated this matter particularly and how recently?

Mr. GARD. I do not know whether the gentleman heard me or not, but I stated that in 1915 a special commission, consisting of three United States Senators and three Representatives in Congress, the gentleman from Illinois [Mr. RAINEY], the gentleman from Wisconsin [Mr. COOPER], and myself, was appointed to consider this matter, and that commission rendered a unanimous report, after practically a month's hearing, that there was no longer any necessity and no reason for adherence to that which is carried in this bill as the half-and-half principle. As I say, there is no reason for it, because it does not operate for any useful purpose. If it did, I would be the last to suggest its abolition.

It has simply resulted in the accumulation of unnecessary amounts of money, gathered from our people all throughout the States of the United States. It will have resulted in the accumulation of nearly \$5,000,000 at the end of the next fiscal year. It can have no other effect, if it be continued for a year or two, than in resulting that the residents of the District of Columbia will have absolutely no taxes to pay. The situation is this, that the United States provides and provides abundantly for the District of Columbia. It holds this to be the national city, and it wants it to be a beautiful and well-kept and orderly city, the seat of this great Government. The Government takes great pride in the city of Washington and in the District of Columbia, and rightfully so, but I maintain there is no reason why the people of the United States should continue to put money into the treasury of the District of Columbia which is unnecessary and unused. Therefore I have offered this amendment, so that the system of taxation may be the same as the system of taxation in every other part of the United States, and that is a fair responsibility upon the part of the residents of the District in the payment of taxes and the recognition on the part of the United States that it is to pay the balance in affording the best facilities of government for this District.

Mr. CANNON. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. GARD. Certainly.

Mr. CANNON. I recollect very well when the half-and-half principle was adopted. It was then stated after something of an investigation that the Government of the United States owned one-half of the property in the District, and certainly if it owned one-half then it owns one-half now, and this law was made, as I understand it, in order that the Government should contribute one-half. I was not in the Chamber when the gentleman's amendment was offered, but if it be in order, and is to be voted upon, will it not result in taxing the property of the citizens of the District not only to support the District government, according to the amount of property, but in putting the whole burden upon the property owners of the District?

Mr. GARD. No.

Mr. CANNON. And as a part of my question I desire to say that I do not now own and never did own and never expect to own one foot of property in the District.

Mr. GARD. I will say for the information of the gentleman—and I think I state it advisedly—that the United States does not now own one-half of the property in the District of Columbia, or anything like it, nor did it ever own half the property in the District of Columbia, and that there is no question of increasing the taxation against any resident in the District. The only purpose of this amendment is to see to it that the estimated revenues, which from the District of Columbia are now \$9,204,372, shall be applied toward the government of the District of Columbia, and that all of the other expenses, no matter what they may be—the balance—shall be contributed by the Federal Government; so that there is no increase against the individual taxpayer, and there should be no increase. He should be liable only for a just and fair assessment upon his

property and for taxes to be paid as the result of a fair tax rate made upon that assessment.

Mr. CANNON. But if the policy is adopted that the gentleman suggests, as Congress is supreme touching taxation in the District, is it not likely that, without consultation with the inhabitants of the District, the taxes will be increased from time to time to raise the whole revenue from the private property in the District, notwithstanding the large amount of property owned by the Government, constantly increasing, and the policing and care of that property?

The CHAIRMAN. The time of the gentleman from Ohio has again expired.

Mr. CANNON. Mr. Chairman, I ask that the gentleman's time may be extended.

Mr. GARD. I do not desire any further time unless the gentleman desires to ask a question.

Mr. CANNON. That is all.

Mr. GARD. I merely desire to say in answer that there is no possibility of an increase in taxation. There is no possibility of anything being done against the individual taxpayer which is not being done now. It is simply that the owner of property, either real estate or personal, shall contribute as do the people of every other city in the United States, a fair proportion of his property as a tax assessment for benefits received, and there his obligation as a resident ceases.

Mr. CANNON. How is that fair amount to be determined?

Mr. JOHNSON of Kentucky. It is already fixed by law.

Mr. GARD. To be determined as now. A man's property is assessed and the tax rate is applied and he pays taxes like the gentleman does in Danville.

Mr. CANNON. Does the gentleman have any doubt if the policy he refers to shall be adopted as to whether the vast amount of property that the United States owns in the District will go without any contribution?

Mr. GARD. Oh, no; not the slightest doubt, because the United States is contributing continually and fully for the ordinary and usual running expenses of the District of Columbia, and pays entirely from the general funds in the Treasury the expenses incident to and necessary for special improvements, such as the erection of new Government buildings and necessary municipal utilities.

Mr. Sisson. Mr. Chairman, of course Members of the House who have been here for several terms without doubt know that this House has repeatedly passed that amendment by an overwhelming majority. The last vote taken on this matter passed this House by more than 2 to 1.

Mr. JOHNSON of Kentucky. More than 100 majority.

Mr. Sisson. And as a last resort a gentleman at that time a Member of the House—Mr. Underwood, of Alabama—amended the conference report by inserting in that report the appointment of this commission, three members from the House and three members from the Senate. The joint committee met and went carefully into this matter and made their report to Congress. This is a result of the report of that committee and is exactly what was done by the Committee on Appropriations when Mr. Page, of North Carolina, was then chairman of the subcommittee and Mr. Davis and I were the two conferees, and the bill passed the House and went to the Senate; and, as I said a moment ago, there the matter was hung up in conference, until we finally just quit and declined to have any further conferences. It was thought at that juncture that the House having instructed us by two overwhelming votes to insist upon that amendment we felt that we were not bound to continue the conference further. Then the gentleman from Alabama, as I stated, offered that compromise. That report has been filed. The expenses of that joint committee were paid out of the funds of the two Houses. So it seems to me that nothing could be fairer than to say that the people of the District of Columbia shall pay only a fair rate of taxation on a fair assessment of property and that that is all they should pay, and if Congress then desires to expend more money than that out of the Federal Treasury it is up to the Congress to do that, and we assume that responsibility. One moment more. If we as Congressmen feel that we do the people of the District of Columbia an injustice, and I am sure we would not, then we ought not to pass this legislation; but there are many things that are being done in the District of Columbia by Congress which would surprise Members of Congress unless they should investigate the matter. There are many Members of Congress who perhaps do not know that the water system in the District of Columbia is owned by the United States Government.

Mr. JOHNSON of Kentucky. And built at the Government's expense.

Mr. Sisson. The aqueduct that brings the water from Great Falls here was built by the Federal Government; every penny of it was paid out of the Federal Treasury. The water mains were all laid out of the United States Treasury, and the District of Columbia contributed nothing. Now, a great many large pieces of property here in the District of Columbia belong to the Government, and yet the Government pays the expense of keeping up the property in respect to sidewalks and streets—

Mr. CANNON. Will the gentleman yield?

Mr. Sisson. Yes.

Mr. CANNON. The income from the water exceeds the outgo, does it not?

Mr. Sisson. Well, it is behind now; considerably behind. I will state to the gentleman there has been a change in the last appropriation bill in reference to the water rents. Formerly it all went into the Treasury, and the United States Government then paid all the expenses of the water system. Now the money, of course, still goes into the Treasury, but the expenses of the water system are paid out of the revenues of the water company itself.

Mr. CANNON. One hand washes the other, and then leaves something to the credit of the United States.

Mr. Sisson. The difference is it keeps the books entirely separate, and the water system is self-sustaining.

The CHAIRMAN. The time of the gentleman has expired.

Mr. Sisson. Mr. Chairman, I ask for two minutes more.

The CHAIRMAN. Is there objection? [After a pause.] The Chair hears none.

Mr. Sisson. As a member of this committee I have investigated this matter with a great deal of care. This amendment will not change the rate of taxation, will not change the assessment, will not change the machinery of assessment, will not change the machinery of collection in the least, and the District citizens will pay not a single penny more than they now pay. The only thing that this amendment does is to provide that before any money shall come out of the Federal Treasury you must first use the money collected on the property in the District of Columbia. Then the balance of this appropriation would be paid out of the Federal Treasury. Now, that is all there is to the amendment.

Mr. JUUL and Mr. CRISP rose.

The CHAIRMAN. The gentleman from Illinois [Mr. JUUL] is recognized.

Mr. JUUL. Mr. Chairman and gentlemen, I understand that the fiscal year ends June 30, 1919, and that it is proposed in this bill, H. R. 11692, to appropriate for the expenses of the District of Columbia the sum of \$13,426,393.66. I understand further that the General Government and the District of Columbia each are required to pay \$6,713,196.83. In the first place, I want it distinctly understood that I am friendly to the District, and if this was a bill to give every man and woman of legal age in the District a vote I would favor it.

We are fighting a great war for democracy, and one of the measures we should hurry along here is to do everything to establish democracy at home, and granting the franchise to Washingtonians would be right in line. But I am unable to understand by what manner of reasoning a wealthy city like Washington, which probably in normal times is having from seventy-five to one hundred millions disbursed among its citizens by the National Government annually, should draw on the States in the Union for any aid toward defraying expenses of its local government.

For the fiscal year ending June 30, 1912, the sum contributed by the States toward running the local expenses of the District of Columbia was \$515,793.83 less than the sum to be contributed this year.

The contribution of my State, based upon its population, was as follows:

Toward the District schools.....	\$98,028
For street sewers and water mains.....	37,676
For police.....	31,277
For local improvements and repairs.....	70,775
For salaries and help.....	25,470
For interest—sinking fund.....	29,887
For lighting.....	14,254
For fire department.....	20,455
For charities and corrections.....	42,807
Miscellaneous.....	9,916

Or a total for Illinois of \$379,945; that is, provided that Illinois contributed only according to population. But everybody knows that the larger States in the Union contributed sums far in excess of the figures here mentioned. And not one dollar of these sums could by any stretch of the imagination be said to be expended for national purposes.

On the above basis New York contributed \$614,103 and the State of Georgia \$175,810 toward paying the local expense of the city of Washington.

Now, I can understand that the United States Government ought to pay its share for street improvements outside of public buildings, and I can further understand that if there is a public building on one side of the street and no private one on the opposite side of the street that probably the Nation should be generous and pay the total cost of such local improvements as might become necessary from time to time. But I absolutely fail to understand why a community like Washington, with a flood of gold being poured daily into its lap, should pass the hat around to the 48 States in the Union and ask them to contribute toward its local expenses.

Mr. WALSH. Will the gentleman yield?

Mr. JUUL. Yes, sir.

Mr. WALSH. The gentleman is making a very interesting statement of this question, but I would like to ask him how he computes the different amounts.

Mr. JUUL. I will give it to the gentleman in a couple of minutes. I would not like to give it in my own time, as I have only five minutes.

To illustrate the situation fully by comparing the District of Columbia, or, rather, the city of Washington, with another great city, I want to repeat here that the tax rate in Washington is \$1.50 per \$100 assessed valuation, and that customarily only 66 per cent of the fair cash value of the property here is assessed. The city of Chicago contains about seven townships, and in these townships the tax rate varies slightly on account of the park taxes, which are not uniform.

The property there is assessed on the basis of one-third of the fair cash value, but instead of having one tax to pay, as in Washington, the following taxes were levied and collected for the year 1916:

State tax	\$0.80
County tax	.66
City tax	1.97
School tax	1.87
Sanitary district	.38
Park tax	.70
Total	6.38

So it will be readily realized that if Congress should decide that Washington should pay its own bills, apparently no hardships would be imposed upon the city.

The answer to all this, of course, might be that the taxes in Washington are not too low, but that the taxes of Chicago are too high, and to the latter part of such proposition I would cheerfully agree, only stating that as a State official in Illinois I and many friends labored hard, as everyone knows in that State, to keep the taxes down, but that the ever-increasing demands of the taxing bodies and the ever-increasing accommodations given to the public in the form of great hospitals, bathing beaches, public baths, playgrounds, libraries, and so forth, brought the taxes up to what they now are in spite of us.

The CHAIRMAN. The time of the gentleman has expired.

Mr. JUUL. Mr. Chairman, I ask unanimous consent for two minutes more.

The CHAIRMAN. Is there objection? [After a pause.] The Chair hears none.

Mr. CANNON. Will the gentleman yield?

Mr. JUUL. Yes.

Mr. CANNON. I believe, in theory, at least, in the State of Illinois, but not in practice, much less property is assessed according to its value and then divided by three, and then that one-third, the gentleman says, is paid, which would make 2 per cent on its value; and yet it is an open secret that the property in the State of Illinois is not assessed, in the first place, at three-fourths of its value.

Mr. JUUL. The gentleman from Illinois states exactly what was correct, but I also want to say for the benefit of the gentleman and the other gentlemen upon this floor that in the State of Illinois, in addition to the approximate 6 per cent on one-third of the fair cash value, there is a special assessment for every local improvement.

In order to be perfectly sure that the property in the District is being assessed on approximately 66 per cent of its present value and that the percentage assessment in Washington as quoted by me here is correct, I called up the tax department in the assessor's office and had the figures verified over the telephone.

It would seem to me that this city ought to be in a position where it could take care of its local expenses and let the Government of the United States devote its \$6,713,196.83 that it is proposed to take out of the National Treasury for national purposes.

I repeat, that it ought to be possible to take this vast sum, which certainly represents the liberty-loan purchases of several

thousand people, and use the money to buy wheat, bacon, clothing, and supplies for our soldiers who are now fighting the battles of our country.

Here is \$6,713,196.83 as a gift or a grant to one of the wealthiest cities in this Union. The only excuse I have heard since I came to Washington as to why the citizens of this city should not pay the expenses of running the city is, "Why should we pay at all? We have no vote." I maintain the bill now pending here does not remedy that evil, but I want to tell you, gentlemen, the day ought to come sooner or later when every citizen of this community should wish to look the citizens from the other parts of the country in the face and wish to pay their own expenses here and not look to the rest of the country for charity.

The gentleman from Massachusetts [Mr. WALSH] asked me what I based my figures on. I want to say to the gentleman the tabulation I have here is for the year 1912-13, and the amount—

The CHAIRMAN. The time of the gentleman has again expired.

Mr. HAMILTON of Michigan. Mr. Chairman, I ask unanimous consent that the gentleman from Illinois may proceed for two minutes more.

The CHAIRMAN. Is there objection? [After a pause.] The Chair hears none.

Mr. JUUL. The gentleman from Massachusetts asked me on what these figures were based. I want to say they are based on the amount levied against the United States Government for District purposes for the fiscal year of 1911-12. And these figures are, as I stated a minute ago, within \$515,793.83 identically the figures of the present year. Now, in that year the gentleman's State of Massachusetts contributed a total of \$226,849 toward running local expenses of the city of Washington. And I maintain that the city of Washington does not need it, ought not to have it, and should not ask for it.

Mr. WALSH. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. JUUL. Yes.

Mr. WALSH. How did the States contribute that money—by a levy of the Government upon each State?

Mr. JUUL. No. Each State pays whatever it has to pay in the form of a tax, internal revenue or otherwise. For instance, the city of Peoria, in my State, has been in the habit of tossing from \$65,000,000 to \$70,000,000 into the National Treasury. The supposition is that that amount of money was tossed into the National Treasury for national purposes.

Mr. WALSH. In other words, it is based on population?

Mr. JUUL. Yes. Instead of utilizing it for national purposes, a part of it at least is being used for local purposes. That is what I object to.

Mr. WALSH. But it is taken out of the returns for internal revenue and income taxes?

Mr. JUUL. Yes, sir. [Applause.]

The CHAIRMAN. The time of the gentleman from Illinois has expired. The gentleman from Indiana [Mr. WOOD] is recognized.

Mr. WOOD of Indiana. Mr. Chairman, this is a very important question. It means the changing of the system of raising revenue and spending it in the city of Washington and the District of Columbia. It may be an old proposition to the older Members here. It is entirely new to the newer Members.

This question was not raised in any manner before the committee having this investigation in charge. It is of sufficient importance, it occurs to me, to warrant its being made an independent measure, where all those interested might have a chance to be heard. I do not think that it is quite fair to the committee itself; I do not believe that it is fair to the people who are vitally affected by it. It is of no concern to me as an individual, except as one of the one hundred million people in the United States. It may be of very great concern to those whose interests are all in the city of Washington.

Above all other times, it occurs to me that this is the most inappropriate time for this radical change. We are living under abnormal conditions throughout this country; in the city of Washington they are more abnormal than in any other place in the United States. By reason of these great war activities here a great amount of wear and tear is going on constantly that would not be reckoned under ordinary circumstances. You take the streets of the city of Washington. They are in bad condition and growing worse constantly by reason of the Government's large trucks and the immense amount of hauling over them, which would not be permitted under any ordinary circumstances.

We saw here the other day that great, immense tank which was brought over here by reason of the war and for the purpose of encouraging and developing enthusiasm for the sale of the Government's bonds. We saw that immense tank going over

the streets of the city and tearing up the paving, much of it, all to pieces. Therefore, it seems to me this is not the time for this change to be made.

I realize that much may be said in favor of this proposition, and I dare say that if it were taken up for investigation much might be said against it. But it occurs to me that now, while this city is torn up from one end to the other by building activities, different from the ordinary conditions in the city of Washington, this radical change should not be had, and this radical change should not be had at any time without the people vitally affected having their day in court.

Mr. SWITZER. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. WOOD of Indiana. Yec.

Mr. SWITZER. Is the report of the commission referred to by the gentleman from Ohio [Mr. GARD] in the hands of the Appropriations Committee or of the District Committee?

Mr. WOOD of Indiana. It is not. I never heard of it before. This question was not even mooted during the weeks of hearings that we had on the bill in the committee. Therefore I say that to the Members of this body who are new here, this is entirely a new and novel question; and it occurs to me that it is of such vital importance that the fullest development of facts and the fullest hearings should be had before any steps are taken toward making this change. If it is a good thing, it will last. They have been under this system for many years, and the results have not been disastrous. They might be disastrous now if the proposed changes were made, and we might bring injustice to those upon whom we would not care to have it brought. If the change is to be had, it should be had in normal times. It should not be had in times so abnormal as we now have in the city of Washington. Therefore I think this amendment should not be carried. It should be at least deferred until the next session of this Congress, when hearings might be had and when those of us who are not acquainted with these investigations might have the opportunity at least of being permitted to read them before we are required to vote upon the question.

The assertion is made by the gentleman from Ohio [Mr. GARD] who is the proponent of this amendment, that it will make no change whatever in the taxation, that it will make no change as far as the assessment of values is concerned. Then what is the real purpose? The real purpose must be that the money now in the Treasury may be expended for governmental purposes.

The CHAIRMAN. The time of the gentleman has expired.

Mr. WOOD of Indiana. I ask for one minute more.

The CHAIRMAN. The gentleman asks unanimous consent to proceed for one minute. Is there objection?

There was no objection.

Mr. WOOD of Indiana. That money may be needed to make the repairs I have spoken about and to replace the wear and tear that is now going on by reason of these extraordinary activities. In any event this radical change should not be made at this time, and until there has been a full and fair investigation.

Mr. JOHNSON of Kentucky. Mr. Chairman, the gentleman from Indiana [Mr. Wood] has just urged that this is not the appropriate time for this change to take place. That argument has been used for many years, until it has become an established fact that an appropriate time will never come for those who favor the continuance of the half-and-half. When a similar amendment was last before the House that same argument was used. Finally, as the gentleman from Mississippi [Mr. Sisson] has just stated, the matter got into conference and was there being thrashed out. When the conferees were deadlocked on the subject Mr. UNDERWOOD, of Alabama, who was then in the House, offered an amendment providing for a commission to investigate this matter and report to Congress, and that was adopted. Three Members of the Senate were appointed and three Members of the House were appointed. If I remember correctly—and I am quite sure I do—all six of those Members voted against doing away with the half-and-half plan; but when they had investigated the subject they brought in a report saying that the half-and-half plan was no longer necessary or advisable. Their report is accessible to every Member who wishes to see it.

Mr. GREEN of Iowa. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield for a question?

Mr. JOHNSON of Kentucky. I do.

Mr. GREEN of Iowa. When was that report filed? I have forgotten.

Mr. JOHNSON of Kentucky. In the first session of the Sixty-fourth Congress.

Mr. GARD. It was filed early in January, 1916.

Mr. JOHNSON of Kentucky. The question arises, what is the use of continuing the half-and-half proposition? Why should the United States Government continue to match dollar

for dollar that is raised here in the way of taxation? As a result of the United States going into her Treasury to pay half, at the end of the next fiscal year there will have accumulated in the treasury of the District of Columbia a surplus of approximately \$5,000,000. Now, with approximately \$5,000,000 in the treasury of the District of Columbia, why should the United States go into her own Treasury to pay any part of the expenses? If there was a deficit in the District treasury, or if the entire amount of money raised by the District of Columbia was being used, then it might be argued that it was worth while to go into the Treasury of the United States to aid the District of Columbia; but with a surplus accumulating all the while, I can not see the necessity for continuing the half-and-half.

Mr. CANNON. Will the gentleman yield?

Mr. JOHNSON of Kentucky. I do.

Mr. CANNON. I believe this \$5,000,000 to the credit of the District of Columbia is deposited in the United States Treasury?

Mr. JOHNSON of Kentucky. It is there as a trust fund.

Mr. CANNON. As a trust fund, and can not get out except by legislation of Congress?

Mr. JOHNSON of Kentucky. It can not.

Mr. CANNON. So the United States has the use of it?

Mr. JOHNSON of Kentucky. But why compel the United States to contribute to a municipal corporation that is so prosperous that it has to its credit \$5,000,000 more than it needs?

Mr. CANNON. And the United States contributes its half, and that remains in the Treasury, does it not, until it is paid out?

Mr. JOHNSON of Kentucky. It remains there until the Commissioners of the District of Columbia draw their warrant against it and take it out and spend it.

Mr. CANNON. If they do, it has got to be done under law.

The CHAIRMAN. The time of the gentleman has expired.

Mr. JOHNSON of Kentucky. Mr. Chairman, I ask unanimous consent for five minutes more.

The CHAIRMAN. The gentleman from Kentucky asks unanimous consent to proceed for five minutes. Is there objection?

There was no objection.

Mr. CARY. Will the gentleman permit an interruption?

Mr. JOHNSON of Kentucky. I will.

Mr. CARY. Is it not a fact that the Government also builds the streets and sewers in the city of Washington?

Mr. JOHNSON of Kentucky. The streets are built on the half-and-half plan. It has been said by the gentleman from Illinois [Mr. CANNON] that somebody has said that the Government owns half the property here.

The Government never has owned that much. Way back yonder in Boss Shepherd's time he got up a table in which he charged all the streets to the United States, all the public space to the United States, all that is in the rivers to the United States, and all the parks to the United States. He charged all these up to the ownership of the United States, and then could not make it appear that the United States owned half of the area of the District of Columbia; but, driven to a final statement, he said the Government then owned approximately half of the values in the District of Columbia. But even that was not true. Now, the claim is made, particularly by the editor of the Star, who seems to be the spokesman for the District of Columbia, not that the District of Columbia pays a greater rate of tax than any other city of comparable size but that the people here pay a greater per capita tax than is paid in other cities. There are a number of rich men here and there are a number of poor people as well. The poor people own nothing or but little and the rich own a great deal, and, in that way, the per capita tax is great. When it comes down to the property tax, I maintain that it is less in this city than in any other city of a comparable size in the world.

Three years ago I made a speech on the subject, and at that time I had before me 40 cities, 20 a little larger in population than the District of Columbia and 20 just a little smaller than the population of the District of Columbia. The property tax in the District of Columbia was less than in any of them. Now, bear in mind one thing, you gentlemen who have not heard the matter discussed before, in the District of Columbia there is but one tax, and that is a municipal tax. The real estate is taxed at a rate of \$1.50 a hundred on a two-thirds valuation, which makes it only \$1 a hundred. That is the only tax it pays, while in every other city of the United States there is a municipal tax, a county tax, and also a State tax. Then it pays school and other special taxes. Here they pay one tax, which makes it a very much less tax than in any other city in the world.

Mr. JUUL. Will the gentleman yield?

Mr. JOHNSON of Kentucky. Yes.

Mr. JUUL. I want to state for the benefit of the gentleman that in my city we pay a local park tax of \$1 on the valuation, also a municipal, county, and State tax, besides a sanitary tax.

Mr. JOHNSON of Kentucky. Before concluding my remarks I wish again to call attention to the fact that during the entire controversy in years gone by the editor of the Washington Star, speaking for the District, has insisted that the half-and-half plan should not be abolished until a fair commission had been appointed to determine whether or not it ought to be done. When this commission was appointed, consisting of six men, every one of whom voted against the abolition of the half-and-half plan, the Star said it was a fair commission, made up of men who were absolutely impartial. Now, when they have reported, the advocates of the half-and-half plan wish to repudiate that report made by the commission selected in the way I have named, and which everyone has said was fair and impartial.

The CHAIRMAN. The time of the gentleman has expired.

Mr. CRISP. Mr. Chairman, I ask unanimous consent that I may proceed for 10 minutes. I have taken but very little time of the House.

The CHAIRMAN. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Georgia? [After a pause.] The Chair hears none.

Mr. CRISP. Mr. Chairman and gentlemen of the House of Representatives, to those who have been here some time I can add nothing to what I have already said on the floor of the House in advocacy of the repeal of what is known as the half-and-half act. In the Sixty-third Congress I introduced a bill to repeal it and made a lengthy speech in favor of the abolition of this law. To the new Members let me say in that Congress the House overwhelmingly passed a bill to repeal the act of June 11, 1878, known as the half-and-half act, and it went to the Senate and there died. In the succeeding Congress similar action was taken in this House, and the Senate again defeated the bill.

Now, there is a great misconception or ignorance among the membership of the House generally as to the municipal laws and affairs in the District of Columbia. It may astonish some of you to learn that when the Government took charge of this territory in 1800, two years thereafter, on May 2, 1802, Congress chartered the city of Washington, so that the city of Washington is a municipal corporation. From that time to 1871 the city of Washington had a mayor and council, managed its own affairs, levied its own taxes, and conducted its business the same as Chicago, Milwaukee, Cleveland, or any other city in the United States. The Government had nothing whatever to do with the municipality save that the Government in a spirit of fairness and equity yearly made such contributions to the municipal government of the city of Washington as Congress thought just, in view of the amount of property the Government owned in the District of Columbia.

This condition continued until 1874, when a commission form of government was created for the District. Why was a commission form of government established? Because in 1867 a law was passed conferring the right of franchise upon the negroes in the District, and they became such an active, discordant element in municipal politics that this commission form of government was adopted. In 1878 the act known as the half-and-half act was passed. Under that act the people here voluntarily gave up their right to vote, and the act provided that the General Treasury should pay half the expenses of the municipal government. My very distinguished and much admired friend, the gentleman from Illinois [Mr. CANNON], in this discussion asked as to the amount of property the Government owned at that time. I have in my hands a copy of a speech which I made upon the floor of the House several years ago relative to this question, and in it I have some figures as to the amount of land owned by the Government. At the time the act known as the half-and-half act was passed there were 6,110 acres of land in the city of Washington covered by that act and the Government owned only 1,523 acres, and nearly all of the land that the Government owned consisted of parks, and the citizens of Washington, of course, got the greatest benefit from those parks. At the present time there are 33,000 acres of land, including the streets and sidewalks, in the District. The Government owns 5,000 acres, and I venture to say there are not 400 acres owned by the Government used exclusively by the Government for its governmental activities. The rest of it is to be found in parks.

Mr. JOHNSON of Kentucky. The gentleman means that not 400 acres are used exclusively by the Government?

Mr. CRISP. That is what I tried to make plain.

Mr. JOHNSON of Kentucky. I went into that subject thoroughly, and I found there are less than 50 acres in the District of Columbia used exclusively for Government purposes.

Mr. CRISP. I wanted to be absolutely fair to the District.

Mr. JOHNSON of Kentucky. And there are 45,000 acres in the District of Columbia.

Mr. CRISP. That effectually disposes of the question of my distinguished friend from Illinois [Mr. CANNON].

What does the proposed amendment do? The proposed amendment simply provides that the citizens of Washington shall be required to pay a reasonable tax, Congress to determine what amount that tax shall be, and when the taxes are paid all the money thus raised shall first be expended in paying the municipal expenses of the District of Columbia, and then whatever other money is necessary, which Congress in its judgment deems should be expended, is to be appropriated out of the General Treasury. What will be the practical effect of this law if it is carried on for a year or two longer? I assert that the citizens of the city of Washington pay a lower rate of property tax than the people of any other city near its size anywhere in the world. Up to the time of the agitation for the repeal of the half-and-half act, there was no tax whatever here on intangible personal property such as money, notes, mortgages, and so forth. Now there is a small tax of three-tenths of 1 per cent upon intangible personal property. The tax upon tangible personal property is \$1.50 a hundred, but there is a tax exemption, I think, of about \$1,000 worth of household furniture, and so forth. The tax upon real estate is \$1.50 a hundred, assessed upon a two-thirds valuation, which makes \$1 a hundred upon the value of the property.

Bear in mind that in your State, gentlemen, you have a city tax, you have a county tax, you have a State tax. There is only one tax here. There is no State tax, there is no county tax. It is simply this city tax, and the tax on real estate is \$1 a hundred. I challenge any one of you to get up and say that in your State, if you live in a city, that your people do not pay a higher tax on real estate than \$1 on the hundred, if such is the case. That is the low rate of taxation here. Carry this act to its logical conclusion and a year or two from now it may not be necessary to levy any taxes here for a year or more. Why? As has been stated in this debate, there is now in the Treasury to the credit of the District of Columbia over \$2,000,000. At the end of June 30, 1918, it is estimated there will be over \$4,000,000 to the credit of the District in the Treasury. In the next year or two, if this surplus continues to be added to, you will have six or seven million dollars in the Treasury to the credit of the District, and then you will not have to levy any tax rate here upon private property, because if you have half enough in the Treasury to the credit of the District to meet one-half of the annual appropriation budget, the United States must pay the other half; thus you have ample funds according to the half-and-half law to pay the entire expenses of the municipality, without levying one cent of tax on private property owners in the District. The people of the several States would be made to bear the tax burdens of the District, in addition to paying their own taxes.

Now, that is why we who believe this law is unjust to the people of the United States are asking that this half-and-half act be repealed. I would not do the citizens of Washington an injustice. I know the Federal Government owns large amounts of property here, and I do not want the Federal activities to be a burden upon the citizens of Washington. I want the Federal Government to pay whatever is equitable, right, and just on account of the property it owns here, but I do not want the people here to be immune from taxation and your constituents and my constituents be made to pay their tax burden. [Applause.]

The CHAIRMAN. The time of the gentleman has expired.

Mr. Sisson. Does the gentleman from Michigan desire to take any time now; if so, how much does he want?

Mr. McLAUGHLIN of Michigan. Five minutes at least.

Mr. GREEN of Iowa. I would like to have five minutes.

Mr. Sisson. Mr. Chairman, I ask unanimous consent that at the end of 10 minutes all debate on this amendment close, and I will state that as soon as the vote is taken on this amendment I expect to move that the committee rise.

The CHAIRMAN. The gentleman from Mississippi asks unanimous consent that all debate on this amendment close at the end of 10 minutes. Is there objection? [After a pause.] The Chair hears none.

Mr. McLAUGHLIN of Michigan. Mr. Chairman, I have given some thought to this matter as it has been before the House from time to time, but I think I have never before taken part in the discussion. I recognize what has been said, as I think others should, that perhaps the half-and-half system is not exactly right or just to the Federal Government, but because of that I am not prepared to accept as correct the plan suggested by the gentleman from Ohio [Mr. GARD] in the amend-

ment he has offered. I do not believe, Mr. Chairman, that this Government ought to escape taxes upon its vast property in the city of Washington or that it ought to pay taxes only in case the people of the city fail to contribute enough money to meet all expenses. I think the Government, owning property of immense value here, ought to pay some taxes; that the Congress ought to be able to determine how much money is necessary to meet expenses of running the city and to make all necessary and proper improvements; that it ought in some way to determine the proportion that the Government should pay and the remaining portion that the people of the District should pay on their property. Now, it is urged by the gentlemen supporting the amendment of the gentleman from Ohio [Mr. GARD] that as the Government contributes in lieu of taxes one-half of the expenses of this city, and the taxable property of the city pays the other half, that because the people and the property of Washington pay a small amount of money, smaller in proportion to the value of the property than is paid in any other city in the country, that therefore it is wrong and that the city is imposing upon the Government. I do not believe that. The people of this city may be so fortunately situated that they can escape a large burden of taxation. If they can properly do so it is their right and privilege. Gentlemen who have spoken lay it as a charge against the people of Washington that their tax rate is low and that taxes are less in proportion to value of property and advantages enjoyed than in other cities of the country; that property owners of Washington have to pay only one tax, a city tax, instead of a number of taxes, such as city, county, and State taxes, as the people of almost every other city in the country have to pay. Washington and its people are not to be blamed for that condition; it is a privilege they enjoy or a burden they escape. It is pointed out that the valuation of taxable property is only two-thirds of the full value and that the rate is only 1½, making a rate of taxation of 1 per cent on the full value, as in some States. That is certainly a very low rate, but the people of this city may be entitled to it. If the Government contributes what it ought to contribute in proportion to the value of its property, if the burden placed upon the people of the District is so reduced that it is only 1 per cent—to an insignificantly small sum—the people of the city are entitled to the benefit of it.

Mr. FESS. Will the gentleman yield?

Mr. McLAUGHLIN of Michigan. I am afraid I have not the time, but I will yield to the gentleman.

Mr. FESS. If there is a surplus in the Treasury, is it not true that probably that could be very well expended for improvements that are very much needed?

Mr. McLAUGHLIN of Michigan. The fact that there is money in the Treasury indicates that too much has been levied, that is all.

Mr. FESS. Has not been expended.

Mr. McLAUGHLIN of Michigan. Perhaps so, but it is true also that too much has been levied. The answer is that the people of the city have paid such a small amount. No people are ever asked or ought to be asked to pay more than enough to run their Government, and the fact that money is left in the Treasury is an indication that the people of the District have paid more than they ought to have been asked to pay under the plan in vogue; that is, the half-and-half plan.

Mr. WALSH. Will the gentleman yield?

Mr. McLAUGHLIN of Michigan. I am afraid I can not. If the half-and-half plan is not right, let it be two-thirds on the city and one-third on the Government, or let it be four-fifths on the city and one-fifth on the Government, but I insist the Federal Government ought not, in justice and right, to escape taxation on all its immense property in this city.

There is a Government building in the city in which I live. The Government pays nothing on it; no taxes. I have heard gentlemen say here that by analogy the Government of the United States ought not to be required to pay taxes on any of its property here. I do not believe that. I do not think the cases are parallel. I think the Government of the United States ought not to pay on its post-office building in my city, but I think it ought to pay, and pay properly, on its immense holdings in the city of Washington.

The CHAIRMAN. The time of the gentleman has expired.

Mr. GREEN of Iowa. Mr. Chairman, this city has benefited immensely by the location of the National Capital here. There are half a dozen cities—I do not know but there are a dozen—that would gladly pay the cost of every public improvement we have in this city and guarantee to never ask a cent from the Public Treasury if only the Capital could be moved there. Every day thousands of dollars are brought in here by reason of the Capital being located at this point. The city benefits every year

hundreds of thousands of dollars by reason of the Capital being here. And if, in my judgment, there was a proper civic spirit on the part of the citizens of this city they would never be asking in time of war that they should not pay the same rate of taxation that is paid in other towns.

Now, what is the situation? A vast fund of millions of dollars has been accumulated in the Treasury. For what purpose? In order that they may be able to reach the time when it will equal the one-half they ought to pay, and then they will not have to pay a cent. It is said that public improvements are needed here. If so, why do not they take this fund and apply it in that way? Why do not they use this money for that purpose instead of endeavoring to create a fund so that they will pay no taxes whatever? Why, at this time, Mr. Chairman, when we are struggling in every way possible to raise the money that is necessary to carry on this great war, do these people come in here and say that they do not even want to pay ordinary taxes the same as are paid in other towns, instead of paying less to-day than is paid in any other city in the country?

Now, what is asked by this amendment of the gentleman from Ohio [Mr. GARD]? What can be fairer than to ask that this fund, which has come out of the low rate of taxes, should be applied to the necessary expenses of this city? If the streets need improving, let them improve them; but, from what I have seen around here, I think somebody has been sitting up of nights trying to find some way of putting more money and more expense on the streets and improvements in this town. A gentleman said that tanks go over the streets and are hard on the paving, but this is not the only town in which tanks have been exhibited. Trucks go over the streets; so they do in other cities. Are the other cities complaining and asking that the Government should contribute more money in order that they may escape their share of just taxation? What reason is there why this amendment should not prevail? There is none, in fairness and justice.

Every citizen of this country at this time should come forward and say, "I want to pay my fair share of taxes. I do not want to be deprived of the privilege of paying my fair share of taxes in this crisis of my country's affairs and when so much money is needed in the country's Treasury." But Washington, I believe, is the only city that can be found where such circumstances could exist. They are unwilling to pay even this lower rate of taxation, which has produced this great fund. They say that the Government owns a large amount of property here. So it has in value. Who takes care of it? The Government. Does it cost the city of Washington anything to police the Capitol or the other Government buildings? No; there would be the same expense for police if these buildings were not here. Do they pay for the walks around them or paving the roads on Government grounds? No. Do they pay for the water supply here or any expenses connected with Government property? No; not a cent. If all this Government property was removed, what would be the difference to the city so far as expenses are concerned? Its officers do not care for it. They pay no attention to it. They have no relation to it.

By the lavish expenditure of public money we have created here the most beautiful city in all this broad land. We have adorned it with magnificent buildings, upon some of which the treasures of art and architecture have been lavished without regard to expense. Hundreds of millions of dollars of public money have been spent upon its broad avenues, its shaded streets, its parks and grounds in making it the cleanest and handsomest city in all America. To this the whole population of the country have contributed, although an insignificant portion only will ever so much as see the objects upon which their money has been spent. Far from objecting to this, the people generally wish to make Washington a show city and the pride of the Nation. They only ask that its citizens shall pay the same taxes as they themselves do. In order that this may be done I favor the amendment of the gentleman from Texas [Mr. BLACK].

The CHAIRMAN. The question is on the amendment offered by the gentleman from Ohio [Mr. GARD].

The question was taken, and the amendment was agreed to.

The CHAIRMAN. The Clerk will read.

The Clerk read as follows:

GENERAL EXPENSES.

Executive office: Two commissioners, at \$5,000 each; engineer commissioner, so much as may be necessary (to make salary \$5,000); secretary, \$2,700; three assistant secretaries to commissioners at \$1,600 each; clerks—one \$1,500, three at \$1,400 each, one \$1,200, one (who shall be a stenographer and typewriter) \$1,200, one \$840, two at \$720 each; two messengers, at \$600 each; stenographer and typewriter, \$1,200.

Mr. SISSON. Mr. Chairman, I move that the committee do now rise.

The motion was agreed to.

Accordingly the committee rose; and the Speaker having resumed the chair, Mr. GARNER, Chairman of the Committee of the Whole House on the state of the Union, reported that that committee had had under consideration the bill H. R. 11692, the District of Columbia appropriation bill, and had come to no resolution thereon.

LEAVE OF ABSENCE.

The SPEAKER laid before the House the following telegram:
BOSTON, MASS., April 30, 1918.

Hon. CHAMP CLARK,
Speaker of the House of Representatives, Washington, D. C.:

Request leave of absence for balance of week on account of important business. Since Government has commandeered wool supply of United States, I, as wool merchant, am compelled to shut up shop and go out of business, practically, and this is just why I am here.

RICHARD OLNEY, M. C.

The SPEAKER. Without objection, the request will be granted.

There was no objection.

LEAVE TO EXTEND REMARKS.

Mr. JUUL. Mr. Speaker, I want to ask unanimous consent to revise and extend my remarks in the RECORD.

The SPEAKER. The gentleman from Illinois asks unanimous consent to extend his remarks in the RECORD. Is there objection? [After a pause.] The Chair hears none.

ENROLLED BILL SIGNED.

Mr. LAZARO, from the Committee on Enrolled Bills, reported that they had examined and found truly enrolled bill of the following title; when the Speaker signed the same:

H. R. 10613. An act to provide for the collection and disposal of garbage and miscellaneous refuse of the District of Columbia.

SENATE BILL REFERRED.

Under clause 2 of Rule XXIV, Senate bill of the following title was taken from the Speaker's table and referred to its appropriate committee, as indicated below:

S. 3771. An act authorizing the President to coordinate or consolidate executive bureaus, agencies, and offices, and for other purposes, in the interest of economy and the more efficient concentration of the Government; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

ADJOURNMENT.

Mr. KITCHIN. Mr. Speaker, I move that the House do now adjourn.

The motion was agreed to; accordingly (at 5 o'clock and 56 minutes p. m.) the House adjourned until to-morrow, Thursday, May 2, 1918, at 12 o'clock noon.

EXECUTIVE COMMUNICATIONS, ETC.

Under clause 2 of Rule XXIV, executive communications were taken from the Speaker's table and referred as follows:

1. A letter from the Secretary of War, transmitting, with a letter from the Chief of Engineers, reports on preliminary examination and survey of Los Angeles Harbor, Cal., with a view to dredging a channel of adequate width and depth in the West Basin (H. Doc. No. 1072); to the Committee on Rivers and Harbors and ordered to be printed, with illustration.

2. A letter from the Acting Secretary of the Treasury, transmitting copy of a communication from the Alien Property Custodian submitting an estimate of appropriation required by the Alien Property Custodian for salaries and expenses of his office for the fiscal year 1919 (H. Doc. No. 1073); to the Committee on Appropriations and ordered to be printed.

3. A letter from the Acting Secretary of the Treasury, transmitting copy of a communication from the Acting Secretary of the Interior, of the 25th instant, submitting a deficiency estimate of appropriation for stationery, Department of the Interior, for the fiscal year 1918 (H. Doc. 1074); to the Committee on Appropriations and ordered to be printed.

4. A letter from the Secretary of War, transmitting, with a letter from the Chief of Engineers, report on preliminary examination of the Missouri River between Yankton and Vermillion, S. Dak. (H. Doc. No. 1075); to the Committee on Rivers and Harbors and ordered to be printed.

REPORTS OF COMMITTEES ON PUBLIC BILLS AND RESOLUTIONS.

Under clause 2 of Rule XIII,

Mr. SIMS, from the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce, to which was referred the bill (H. R. 10297) to amend an act entitled "An act to promote the safety of employees and travelers upon railroads by compelling common carriers

engaged in interstate commerce to equip their locomotives with safe and suitable boilers and appurtenances thereto," approved February 17, 1911, reported the same with amendment, accompanied by a report (No. 533), which said bill and report were referred to the Committee of the Whole House on the state of the Union.

PUBLIC BILLS, RESOLUTIONS, AND MEMORIALS.

Under clause 3 of Rule XXII, bills, resolutions, and memorials were introduced and severally referred as follows:

By Mr. DILLON: A bill (H. R. 11847) to confer further jurisdiction and powers upon the Court of Claims to determine and report the interest, title, ownership, and right of possession of the Yankton Tribe of Sioux Indians in and to the land known as the Red Pipestone Quarries; to the Committee on Indian Affairs.

By Mr. SIMS: A bill (H. R. 11848) to amend section 336 of the Revised Statutes of the United States, relating to the annual report on the statistics of commerce and navigation of the United States with foreign countries; to the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce.

By Mr. DENT: A bill (H. R. 11849) to authorize the President to further increase temporarily the Military Establishment of the United States; to the Committee on Military Affairs.

By Mr. ZIHLMAN: A bill (H. R. 11850) in relation to the chief clerk and others in the Steamboat-Inspection Service; to the Committee on the Merchant Marine and Fisheries.

By Mr. VARE: Joint resolution (H. J. Res. 285) providing for the designation of an official insignia for the relatives of members of the Army, Navy, or Marine Corps who lose their lives in active service in the war with Germany and Austria; to the Committee on Military Affairs.

By Mr. CAREW: Memorial of the Legislature of the State of New York, pledging its resources to the vigorous prosecution of the war, and favoring the entrance of the United States into a league of nations to safeguard peace; to the Committee on Foreign Affairs.

By Mr. KENNEDY of Rhode Island: Memorial of the General Assembly of the State of Rhode Island, indorsing the proposed council of States on the establishment of a definite relationship between sources of Federal and State revenues; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

PRIVATE BILLS AND RESOLUTIONS.

Under clause 1 of Rule XXII, private bills and resolutions were introduced and severally referred as follows:

By Mr. AYRES: A bill (H. R. 11851) granting a pension to Mary L. Colwell; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

By Mr. BORLAND: A bill (H. R. 11852) granting an increase of pension to John H. Beatty; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

By Mr. BOOHER: A bill (H. R. 11853) granting a pension to Willets Haas; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

By Mr. BURNETT: A bill (H. R. 11854) granting an increase of pension to Richard G. Myrick; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

By Mr. GOOD: A bill (H. R. 11855) granting a pension to Eliza McDaniel; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

By Mr. HAMILL: A bill (H. R. 11856) granting an increase of pension to William H. Black; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

By Mr. IGOE: A bill (H. R. 11857) granting a pension to Hattie Geske; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 11858) granting a pension to Lillie Geske; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 11859) granting a pension to Bertha Hansmann; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

By Mr. JUUL: A bill (H. R. 11860) granting a pension to Margaret Holly; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

By Mr. McANDREWS: A bill (H. R. 11861) granting a pension to Lewis H. Abbott; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 11862) granting a pension to Marie W. Rocky; to the Committee on Pensions.

By Mr. PURNELL: A bill (H. R. 11863) granting a pension to Edward S. Coffin; to the Committee on Pensions.

By Miss RANKIN: A bill (H. R. 11864) granting an increase of pension to Alfred Blake; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 11865) for the relief of A. F. Meldrum; to the Committee on Claims.

By Mr. SANDERS of New York: A bill (H. R. 11866) granting an increase of pension to Christian Miller; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

By Mr. SWITZER: A bill (H. R. 11867) granting an increase of pension to Franklin Forgey; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 11868) granting an increase of pension to Thomas P. Byers; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 11869) granting a pension to William A. Fox; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

PETITIONS, ETC.

Under clause 1 of Rule XXII, petitions and papers were laid on the Clerk's desk and referred as follows:

By Mr. CARY: Petition of Archbishop Messmer, urging the exemption of divinity students in the new draft law; to the Committee on Military Affairs.

By Mr. DARROW: Resolutions adopted by the Philadelphia Bourse, advocating free zones in the ports of the United States; to the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce.

Also, petition of the Pennsylvania State Executive Committee, Patriotic Order Sons of America, in behalf of House bill 9786, allowing reduced rates of transportation for men in the military and naval service of the United States; to the Committee on Military Affairs.

By Mr. FULLER of Illinois: Petitions of the Jacksonville (Ill.) Creamery Co. and J. R. Middendorf, opposing enactment of House bill 3777; to the Committee on Agriculture.

By Mr. JOHNSON of Washington: Memorial of the mayor and councilmen of the city of Tacoma, Wash., favoring regulation of prices of wheat substitutes; to the Committee on Agriculture.

By Mr. MEEKER: Petition of 20 citizens of St. Louis, in favor of prohibiting the sale of all intoxicating beverages during the period of the war; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. MOORE of Pennsylvania: Resolutions passed by a mass meeting in Philadelphia Sunday, April 21, protesting against the conscription of the manhood of Ireland by England; to the Committee on Foreign Affairs.

By Mr. NOLAN: Memorial of Associated Chambers of Commerce of the Pacific Coast (C. W. Burks, secretary), San Francisco, Cal., favoring permanent merchant marine and foreign trade policy for the United States; to the Committee on the Merchant Marine and Fisheries.

By Mr. WELTY: Resolution of the Lima (Ohio) Trades and Labor Council, in the matter of Thomas J. Mooney et al.; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

SENATE.

THURSDAY, May 2, 1918.

Rev. J. L. Kibler, of the city of Washington, offered the following prayer:

O God, our Father in heaven, we thank Thee for Thy great love and for the multitude of Thy tender mercies. We thank Thee for all the provisions of Thy grace and for our marvelous opportunities amid the dangers of to-day. We thank Thee for all the supplies Thou hast through Thy kind providence placed in our hands. Help us to lay hold upon these forces for meeting all the demands that are upon us and for meeting the demands of this critical time.

O Thou God of battles, help us at this time. Strengthen our armies that are battling for the right across the seas to-day. Uphold Thou the laws of justice and righteousness for which they contend and which are the habitations of Thy throne. As Thy right hand and Thy holy arm brought victory to Israel in the long ago, so may we trust in Thy almighty power to-day, and may the time speedily arrive when wars shall cease to the ends of the earth and when permanent peace shall be established among all nations. We ask it in the name of Christ the Lord. Amen.

The Vice President being absent, the President pro tempore assumed the chair.

The Secretary proceeded to read the Journal of the proceedings of the legislative day of Tuesday, April 30, 1918, when, on request of Mr. OVERMAN and by unanimous consent, the further reading was dispensed with and the Journal was approved.

AIRCRAFT PRODUCTION.

Mr. BRANDEGEE. Mr. President, the other day I presented to the Senate a communication written by Mr. Gutzon Borglum to the New York Times relating to our aeroplane service. It was stated on the floor by certain of my friends on the other side of the Chamber at that time that there were intimations that Mr. Borglum had some financial interest connected in some way

with aeroplanes or aeronautics. I did not know about that matter and could not say anything about it at all, and so I was unprepared to enter upon that phase of it. Of course, if he had, naturally any criticism that he made upon the service or the production of aircraft would be to a certain extent discounted.

I have received from Mr. Borglum a telegram which, I think, in justice to him ought to be read by the Secretary, giving his statement about whether he is interested or not financially. I should like to have the Secretary read it.

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. Is there objection? The Chair hears none, and the Secretary will read.

The Secretary read as follows:

STAMFORD, CONN., April 30, 1918.

Senator BRANDEGEE,

Capital Building, Washington, D. C.:

Please deny absolutely that I had or have interest in any aeroplane company or monetary benefits by result of inquiry. That I and others invented by interests who most dread investigation, and since middle of January have used every means to invalidate and interfere even with Senate inquiry. I also deny that I have discussed other than general evidence with anybody, nor will I, except before a judicial non-partisan body. My letter to Times, written solely to protest against automobile interests blaming Squier for everything. Aeronautic production is still in the clutches of the ring and no headway will be made by Mr. Ryan or anyone else until that is broken up. Tell Senator THOMAS that the only reason my inquiry hurts anybody is that it is expert. My inquiry was finished February 12.

GUTZON BORGLUM.

Mr. BRANDEGEE. The New York Times on yesterday published a review of the report, with the full text of the findings of the Aeronautical Society of America, in relation to this same subject, and I ask that that be read by the Secretary.

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. Is there objection? The Chair hears none, and the Secretary will read.

The Secretary proceeded to read and was interrupted by Mr. THOMAS. Mr. President, may I ask what the Secretary is reading? I have just come into the Chamber.

Mr. BRANDEGEE. He is reading an account in the New York Times of the report of the investigations of the Aeronautical Society of America.

Mr. THOMAS. In yesterday's issue?

Mr. BRANDEGEE. Yes, sir; in yesterday's issue.

The Secretary resumed and concluded the reading of the matter.

Mr. WADSWORTH subsequently said: Mr. President, in view of the statement made a few moments ago by the Senator from Arkansas [Mr. KIRBY] with respect to the report of the Aeronautical Society of America, out of order I ask unanimous consent that the full report be included in the remarks of the Senator from Connecticut [Mr. BRANDEGEE], who is just now absent from the Chamber and who made the original request. Objection was made by the Senator from Arkansas, which was later withdrawn.

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. Does the Senator desire it printed in the Record in lieu of the partial report?

Mr. WADSWORTH. In lieu of the partial report, as read from a copy of a newspaper.

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. Is there objection to the request of the Senator from New York? The Chair hears none, and it is so ordered.

The report referred to is as follows:

THE AERONAUTICAL SOCIETY OF AMERICA (INC.),

New York, April 2, 1918.

FREDERICK W. BARKER, Esq.,

President of the Aeronautical Society of America,

New York City.

SIR: I beg to transmit herewith the first report of the investigating committee of the Aeronautical Society of America.

Respectfully,

LEON CAMMEN, Chairman.

REPORT.

The investigating committee of the Aeronautical Society of America was appointed in August, 1917, with instructions to follow the developments in the execution of the aeronautical program and to advise the society of any opportunities which might offer themselves for it to be of service to our Government.

It has, however, become apparent at an early date that the execution of the aeronautical program was being diverted into paths where the possibility of success was distinctly imperiled. As time went on the committee saw with dismay the issuance of statements by the Government which it was compelled to regard as untrue. For a while it was under the impression that such statements were issued for the deliberate purpose of misleading the enemy. It regrets to have to say, however, that it has become apparent since that it was to mislead the American people that these statements were issued.